

1971

# Self concept among selected Iowa school teachers and administrators as measured by a self report

Marl Edgar Ramsey  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ramsey, Marl Edgar, "Self concept among selected Iowa school teachers and administrators as measured by a self report " (1971).  
*Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 4503.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/4503>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

72-5251

RAMSEY, Marl Edgar, 1938-  
SELF CONCEPT AMONG SELECTED IOWA SCHOOL  
TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS AS MEASURED  
BY A SELF REPORT.

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1971  
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Self concept among selected Iowa  
school teachers and administrators  
as measured by a self report

by

Marl Edgar Ramsey

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Subject: Educational Administration

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Area

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For ~~the~~ Graduate College

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa

1971

PLEASE NOTE:

Some Pages have indistinct  
print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	3
Definition of Terms	8
Delimitations	10
Source of Data	11
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
History of Self	12
Research on Self Concept	16
Self Concept and the Teacher	21
Self Concept and the School Administrator	24
The Measurement of Self Concept	30
Summary	33
METHODOLOGY	35
The Sample	35
The Tennessee Self Concept Scale	38
Special Data	41
The Statistical Analysis	44
The Hypotheses	45
Summary	50
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	51
Hypotheses Tested	51
Hypotheses 1-12	54
Hypotheses 13-24	55
Hypotheses 25-36	56
Summary of Hypotheses 1-36	59
Hypotheses 37-48	62
TSCS Item Analysis	68
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	73
Summary	73
Interpreting the TSCS scores	75
Question one	76
Question two	77
Question three	78
Question four	79
Self concept dimensions	81
Limitations	83
Discussion	84

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Conclusions	86
Recommendations	87
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	89
APPENDIX A	98
APPENDIX B	100

## LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Mean scores on the TSCS used in this investigation	52
Table 2	The standard deviations of the TSCS factors used in this investigation	53
Table 3	Tests of the significant differences between the means of the norm group and selected teachers on factors of the TSCS	55
Table 4	Tests of the significant differences between the means of the norm group and selected administrators on factors of the TSCS	57
Table 5	Tests of the significant differences between the means of selected teachers and selected administrators on factors of the TSCS	58
Table 6	Tests of the significant differences between the means of selected teachers and selected superintendents on factors of the TSCS	60
Table 7	Significant mean differences found in this investigation	61
Table 8	Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected administrators on self concept regarding various other factors	63
Table 9	Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected administrators on self concept regarding various factors	64
Table 10	Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected superintendents on self concept regarding various factors	65
Table 11	Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected superintendents on self concept regarding various factors	66
Table 12	Items of the TSCS showing consistent response patterns of selected school superintendents	69
Table 13	Items of the TSCS now showing consistent response patterns by selected school superintendents	71

## INTRODUCTION

"Every man is in some respects like all other men, like some other men, and like no other man." (Kluckhorn and Murray, 1953, p. 53) Each of us is a distinct individual and as a unique being we respond to similar stimuli in a unique fashion. We have our own needs to fulfill, our appetites vary, but we will strive to fulfill them, even at the expense of others.

The most pressing problem facing man today is himself. The tremendous strides of the physical sciences in the past few decades have given man an almost unlimited degree of control over his physical environment. . . . The satisfaction of human needs cannot be achieved by control over our physical environment alone. It is a function, even more, of man's relationship with man. (Syngg and Combs, 1949, p. 3)

As man civilized himself he first dealt with his most basic needs; those having to do with his safety and physiological well-being. Perhaps much of our world is still in this state. However, our society at least looks beyond this level. As a growing and crowding nation we have been confronted by problems above physical safety and physiological satisfaction. We have not learned to live together, understand each other, care for one another, and help each other. We have yet to learn to live in groups. We are living with competition rather than cooperation.

A tool to help in the understanding of man is the concept of personality. The field of personality is vast and complex and, as a realm of study, has expanded rapidly in recent years. Sanford sums 16 cited definitions of personality with

. . . a very inclusive or comprehensive something, embracing parts or elements - processes, subsystems, characteristics - which are organized or patterned. (Sanford, 1963, p. 497)



The assumption is made here that personality exists as an organized whole, that it consists of parts or elements and is separated somehow from an environment with which it interacts.

Discussion of personality can be divided into: (1) the nature of personality variables, (2) the interrelationship among and between variables, (3) the boundaries around the effect of the different variables and (4) the relationship between variables and other phenomena. (Sanford, 1963, p. 489)

It is the latter relationship that was studied here.

In one form or another, researchers have studied openness, open-mindedness, closed-mindedness, trust, thrust, aloofness, authoritarianism, aggressiveness, risk taking, independence, radicalness, dogmatism, tenseness, imagination, consideration, production emphasis, dominance, submissiveness, adventurousness, sensitivity, confidence, the forthright, the assertive and the outgoing. It was the purpose of this study to examine the self concept. Moreover to study the relative presence of self concept among public school professional employees.

The self concept has evolved from psychological interests in the study of self and can be defined as "self as the individual that is known to himself" (Wylie, 1961, p. 1). A "high" self concept means a person has accepted himself and is therefore more capable of accepting others. A person with a high self concept may be more able to tolerate the tension brought on by an imbalanced structure since he himself is more balanced. He is generally more open-minded and less dependent upon events in his environment in the determination of his adequacy. This is a mind set we would desire for our public school teachers and administrators.

If society is to deal with the problems of compacted group living, it must deal with them in the public schools. Enrollment in schools from

kindergarten through graduation now includes all segments of the population. People will live together as adults as they have learned as children. The values, examples, experiences and assistance received as children, to a large degree, affect adult behavior.

If schools are staffed by professional personnel who are maladjusted or psychologically inadequate, then adequate and necessary experiences for the children will be lacking. A person who cannot deal with his own problems cannot be expected to adequately help others, especially the young, deal with theirs. People with low self concepts are often maladjusted and uncomfortable and are generally more easily persuaded and led. Neither a teacher, who daily must help children, nor an administrator, who daily must help teachers, should be so developed.

A person's picture of himself is inseparably linked with his experience in social relationships. A man's self may be defined in terms of his unique manner of playing his roles.

In fulfilling his minimal level of obligations, each person develops his own unique pattern of characteristics, a pattern that is evident in different areas of endeavor and over some period of time. The group's picture of a person's self determines their reaction to him. (Miller, 1963, Pp. 671-672)

A person with a high self concept understands himself, his shortcomings, his potential, his ideals and consistently acts accordingly. We cannot understand a person's behavior without knowing his concept of self.

### The Problem

"Self" study has been conducted with a variety of terms. Self image, self perception, self esteem, self realization, self actualization and

self concept are some of the terms used. However, self concept has come to have a body of knowledge of and about it that is significant in volume and importance. Snygg and Combs did much to lead the way in the study of self concept. In their book "Individual Behavior" they set the scene for study of the phenomenal self concept.

We have stated that all behavior is a function of the phenomenal field. This phenomenal field we have described as the universe as it appears to the individual at any moment. Not all parts of the field however will be equally important in the motivation of behavior at any instant. Of particular importance will be those parts of the phenomenal field perceived by him to be part or characteristic of himself. To refer to this important aspect of the total field we have used the term phenomenal self. (Snygg and Combs, 1949, p. 111)

There will often be times in phenomenological psychology whenever such a delimited concept as the phenomenal self includes many extraneous factors not essential to the prediction of behavior. Although the tip of my little finger is certainly part of my phenomenal self, it is seldom differentiated into figure in the course of my daily life. The same is true with respect to many other ideas and concepts which are part of my phenomenal self. It is only rarely, for instance, that I have fixed a leaky faucet and conceive of myself as an amateur plumber. Nor is my occasional concept of myself as one likely to be of major importance in understanding by behavior. On the other hand, I conceive of myself as a professor six days a week and sometimes on Sunday and holidays. This description of myself is very frequently in figure in my phenomenal field and exerts a very considerable influence on my behavior a good deal of the time. . . . These highly differentiated, more or less permanent aspects of the phenomenal self make up my concept of myself. We may define this self concept as follows: the self concept includes those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual has differentiated as definite and fairly stable characteristics of himself. (Snygg and Combs, 1949, p. 112)

The role of the teacher is a unique one. The teacher plays a large part in the development of children and their adjustment to adult society. They have a close and lasting contact with many children for the expressed purpose of making them better adjusted individuals. This is a responsible

position that requires a stable person who understands himself so that he may accept and understand the children he must help. This is an emotionally charged role that requires the teacher, as the adult image, to remain calm and exhibit those qualities he wishes to instill in the children.

What can be said of the teacher can be multiplied many times over for the administrator. His responsibility is spread over many classes of children and over many teachers. He must be even more stable and aware of his "self". In his relationships with children, parents and teachers he must set an even higher standard of what society desires to be the product of the schools.

The self concept of the teacher and especially the administrator should be high. The main question of this study was: are they high? Logically, both groups should differ from the general population in their level of self concept, they should be higher. Logically also administrators should differ from teachers, and under different circumstances, might differ from each other.

Using a set of statements that reflect the feelings of the general culture such comparisons can be made. Establishing a set of normal responses from the general population to these statements yield a benchmark to which specific groups can be compared. The statements should be about a person's self and the norm of the statements should be the measured reaction of some group representing our general culture. A group from another culture might react differently and selected groups from within our culture might also react differently. Such a set of statements and accompanying normative data would give meaning to terms such as high

self concept and low self concept. A high self concept person is one that responds to the statements more as the general culture would expect him to and in a manner consistent with both his beliefs and his behavior. A low self concept person is one that responds less like the general culture and demonstrates inconsistencies between his belief and behavior.

It would be a mistake to think of a high self concept individual only as conforming to the general culture. While this may be partly true, he has realistically assessed it, formed his own beliefs in relation to it and consistently acts accordingly. Such a person functions well in relation to other people, groups and cultural stimuli because he is not frustrated or disturbed by them. He understands his relationship to them. Such a person logically is needed for the instruction of the youth in any culture.

In the normal school and classroom setting a high self concept is needed to develop learning, organization and interpersonal relation strategies that will have positive effects on the students. The administrator in his larger role even more so.

At present there is no empirical knowledge available as to specific self concept differences between teachers and administrators with the general population. There is no collection of information to indicate whether school personnel are, in effect, different in self concept from any other group of people. It is the purpose of this study to investigate the possible existence of any such difference.

There are many different forms of culturally accepted "self". Logically there could be the self others see, the self I actually am, the

self I idealize myself to be, the self I would like to be and the self I think others see. Fitts (1965) outlines the physical self, the moral-ethical self, the personal self, the family self and the social self. Each of these forms of self is important.

The primary hypotheses of this study in the null form are given below.

- (1) There is no significant difference between the general population and teachers in:
  - a. self-criticism
  - b. identity self
  - c. feeling self
  - d. behavioral self
  - e. overall self concept
  - f. physical self
  - g. moral-ethical self
  - h. personal self
  - i. family self
  - j. social self
  - k. variability of self
  - l. definiteness about self
- (2) There is no significant difference between the general population and school administrators in a-1 above.
- (3) There is no significant difference between teachers and school administrators in a-1 above.

Special emphasis was devoted to school administrators. It was hypothesized that there were other factors about the administrator himself and the school he administered about which self concept varied. A secondary purpose of the study was to investigate possible self concept differences among administrators.

The number of years the administrator had been in his position, the number of years as an administrator, the number of years he taught before becoming an administrator, the amount of training he received, the recency

of the training and the type of administrative position he held were all explored and compared with self concept.

Certain characteristics such as school size, type of school and size of the central office staff were hypothesized to be sources of variance in the study of the school administrator. The secondary hypotheses in the null form are stated below.

(4) There is no significant difference in overall self concept among school administrators and:

- a. type of administrative position
- b. years of experience in the present position
- c. years of experience in similar positions
- d. years of experience in education
- e. highest degree held
- f. amount of recent college training
- g. the number of students supervised
- h. rural and urban districts
- i. sibling order
- j. high school extra-curricular activities
- k. socio-economic level of parents

#### Definition of Terms

To avoid ambiguity as well as to establish a framework of constructs, a list of definitions is included.

Phenomenal self concept includes those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual has differentiated as definite and fairly stable characteristics of himself. The self as he is known to himself.

Personality is a very inclusive or comprehensive something, embracing parts or elements - processes, subsystems, characteristics - which are organized or patterned.

A teacher is any person certified to teach in an Iowa public school and employed for one half a school day or more in such a position at the time of data collection.

An administrator is a person certified to administer at any grade level in an Iowa public school and employed for one half a school day or more in such a position at the time of data collection.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was copyrighted in 1965 and consists of 100 self descriptive statements which the subject uses to portray his own picture of himself.

Self criticism is the score on the TSCS on ten mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them. High scores generally indicate a normal, healthy openness and a capacity for self criticism. Low scores indicate defensiveness.

Identity self is that portion of the self concept dealing with "what I am". The individual describes how he feels about the self he perceives.

Feeling self is that portion of the self concept wherein the individual describes how he feels about the self he perceives.

Behavioral self is that portion of the self concept wherein the individual describes how he acts. The individual's perception of his own behavior or the way he functions.

Physical self is that portion of the self concept wherein the individual is presenting his view of his body and state of health.

Moral-ethical self is that portion of the self concept wherein the individual describes his satisfaction with his religion or lack of it.

Family self is that portion of the self concept that reflects one's feelings of adequacy, worth and value as a family member.

Social self is that portion of the self concept that reflects self in relation to others in a general way. It reflects the person's sense of adequacy and worth in his social interaction.

Variability represents the deviation of response on the TSCS. High scoring persons tend to compartmentalize certain areas of self and view these areas quite apart from the remainder of self. Well integrated people generally score below the mean.

Distribution represents the certainty of feelings about self as given by extreme responses on the TSCS. High scores indicate that the subject is very definite and certain in what he says about himself while low scores mean the opposite.



### Delimitations

This study was limited to a description of the measured self concept in the groups herein tested by comparing them with other groups. No inferences beyond the groups included in the study can be made. No inferences of relative quality or worth of the groups herein tested can be made. The purpose of the study was simply to measure the self concept of various public school teacher and administrator groups and to make comparisons.

The collection of personal data needed to assess self concept was difficult. There existed no empirical base on which to seek cooperation of randomly selected teachers and administrators. There was no empirical evidence available to use to convince individuals the value of giving personal information about themselves. This study was conducted using volunteers. It was the hope that such data, when analyzed, would provide an empirical base for future studies of this type.

The data were collected using a self report form. There are deficiencies in such a procedure. They are response-response type designs as opposed to stimulus-response types. This means the "stimulus" must be inferred from the response and eliminates any use of cause and effect conclusions. Further possible measurement malfunctions may result from: (1) the subject's intent to only selectively reveal information to the examiner; (2) the subject's intent to reveal things he does not have; (3) the subject's response habits and (4) a host of situational and methodological factors (Wylie, 1961, p. 24). Caution was exercised in the administration of the measure to insure confidential results and

uniform response environment. However the results are limited by the above named possible weaknesses and to the self concept as defined by the measure.

#### Source of Data

Data were collected from four sources. One was a group of central Iowa school teachers and administrators that were named by their respective school districts as educational leaders. A second source was the group of school administrators attending the annual Iowa State University fall workshop in 1970. A third source was participants in various Polk County, Iowa in-service education programs during 1969 and 1970. A fourth source was students attending a selected graduate seminar during the fall quarter of 1970 at Iowa State University.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter contains the review of related literature. A rich history of "self" beginning with William James (1890), through Freud (1935) and up to modern times is given. Research on self concept, that begins about 1950, is reviewed as it relates to education. Ruth Wylie's book of 1961 and Stanley Coopersmith's writings (1967, 1969) are cited and the research on "significant others" receives special emphasis. The writings of Combs (1965) and Hamachek (1965, 1966, 1969) relating self concept to teaching are reviewed. Self concept is next related to the school administrator and other studies concerning the administrator are cited. Finally the measurement of self concept is discussed with arguments about the "self report" receiving special attention. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale is explained as a widely used measure of self concept.

## History of Self

Self and self concept have cyclically risen to levels of prominence since psychology became a science of human behavior around 1860. Much of the contemporary theoretical framework about self concept came from the early American psychologist William James when, in 1890, he published the book Principles of Psychology. As he theorized it,

A man's self, in its widest possible sense, is the sum total of all that he can call his, not only his beliefs and his psychic power, but his clothes and his house, his wife and children, his ancestors and friends, his reputation and work, his hands and horses and yacht and bank account. (James, 1890, p. 291)

Later he wrote:

To have a self that I care for, nature must first present me with some object interesting enough to make me instinctively wish to appropriate it for its own sake. . . (James, 1890, p. 319)

James considered the ego the individual's sense of identity. In addition to this global concept, he felt that self included spiritual, material, and social aspects. Through James the self was given a dynamic quality in terms of self preservation and seeking.

In Ruth Wylie's review of the subject (1961), a dormancy was noted through the first part of this century. However, G. W. Allport wrote on the self in 1937. He called the ego or self the function of the personality comprised of awareness of self, bodily sense, self image, self esteem and identity.

George Herbert Mead set forth a concept of self which added to the impact of the self on psychology. Mead's self was a socially formed self. It could develop only in a social setting where there was social communication. The self was an object of awareness. He conceptualized that:

There are two general states in the full development of the self. At the first of these stages, the individual's self is constituted simply by an organization of the particular attitudes of other individuals toward himself and toward another in the specific social acts in which he participates with them. But at the second stage in the full development of the individual's self, that self is constituted not only by an organization of these particular individual attitudes, but also by an organization of the social attitudes of the generalized other, or the social groups as a whole, to which he belongs. These social or group attitudes are brought within the individual's field of direct experience and are included as elements in the structure or constitution of his self. (Mead, 1947, p. 186)

Freud (1935) gives the ego a central place in his theory of personality structure. However self-image is unimportant in Freud's ego. To him the ego makes rational choices and thus controls actions in a healthy person. This concept seems almost mystic and untestable. However, somehow the ego maintains a balance between morals and natural impulses.

According to Kurt Lewin (1936), the self concept is represented by a life space region which determines present belief about the self. The term "life space" is a psychological concept to be distinguished from physical space. It includes the individual's universe of personal experience as a space in which he moves. Life space can be considered an internal mechanism which produces and thereby controls behavior. Lewin's life space is similar to "self".

Opposed to Freud's repetition of instinctual themes, Carl Jung saw a constant and often creative development, the search for wholeness and completion similar to a motivation towards "life space". He saw the self as the midpoint of personality, around which all other systems revolve.

In the last resort it is a man's moral qualities which force him. . . to assimilate his unconscious self and to keep himself fully conscious. (Jung, 1966, p. 136)

Jung's concept of self can be likened to what has become to be called the ideal self.

Percival M. Symonds (1951) viewed the ego and self as distinct aspects of personality. However, he saw considerable interaction between them and did not separate the ego from the social setting. According to Symonds, the group of processes making up the ego functions more effectively when the self is held in high regard.

Unlike Jung, Carl Rogers believed in the discontinuity of the unconscious and conscious. He defined the well-adjusted person as one who is able to accept into his personality organization all perceptions, including those related to his self concept.

It would appear that when all the ways in which the individual perceives himself - all perceptions of the qualities, abilities, impulses, and attitudes of the person, and all perceptions of himself in relation to others - are accepted into the organized conscious concept of the self, then this achievement is accompanied by feelings of comfort and freedom from tension which are experienced as psychological adjustment. (Rogers, 1947, p. 364)

Rogers' view of the self supports the position that self acceptance leads to acceptance of others.

Snygg and Combs are called "phenomenologists" because of the central role they accord to conscious feelings, cognitions, and perceptions. In their view "all behavior, without exception, is completely determined by and pertinent to the phenomenal field of the behaving organism." (Snygg and Combs, 1949, p. 15) That is, how a person behaves is the result of how he perceives the situation and himself at the moment of his action. How a person feels and thinks, in fact, determines his course of action thus making awareness the cause of the behavior. Phenomenology is the study of the awareness.

Harry Stack Sullivan (1953) emphasized a theory of interpersonal relationships as an interaction between personality development and culture. Sullivan and Mead (1947) seem in agreement concerning the development of a self concept through the interaction of other persons considered significant by the self. The "significant others" are persons who most intimately provide rewards and punishments for the self.

Abraham H. Maslow felt as Rogers did, that

. . . no psychological health is possible unless this essential inner core of the person (the self) is fundamentally accepted, loved, and respected by others and by himself. . . .  
(Maslow, 1962, p. 36)

Maslow developed a theory of motivated behavior based upon needs, with a hierarchy of human needs ranging from physiological needs to self actualization. The self develops through its natural core and the ultimate need to enhance itself within its phenomenal field.

In 1961 Ruth Wylie reviewed almost 500 studies on self concept. She wrote:

In psychological discussions the word "self" has been used in many different ways. Two chief meanings emerge, however: the self as subject or agent, and the self as the individual who is known to himself . . . the words "self concept" have come into common use to refer to the second meaning. (Wylie, 1961, p. 1)

She labeled the state of self concept study at that time as disappointing. The summary statement of her impression of the literature is:

We have noted that the empirical research on constructs concerning the self cannot be classified according to theoretically relevant categories because the theories are vague, incomplete and overlapping; and, because no one theory has received extensive, empirical exploration. . . . In short, the total accumulation of substantiative findings is disappointing, especially in proportion to the great amount of effort which obviously has been expended. (Wylie, 1961, p. 317)

### Research on Self Concept

No author has written a summary of research since Wylie (1961). However the amount of research that has been conducted since Wylie is at least as great as that done prior to her review. Over 200 studies of self concept have been done within the last ten years using the Tennessee Self

Concept Scale alone and there are many other measures in use. In a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association in 1969, Stanley Coopersmith summarized related studies.

Self concept has been related to analytical thinking (Witkin, 1962); creative ability (Coopersmith, 1967, and Machinnon, 1962); with the ability to participate in discussions and express a point of view (Rosenberg, 1965, and Coopersmith, 1967); with persistence in performing tasks (Diggory, 1966); and with the ability to maintain a constant perceptual framework in the face of confounding conditions (Coopersmith, 1967). Persons with high self concepts are more likely to be leaders in their social groups, more concerned about public affairs rather than personal problems, and less sensitive and anxious (Rosenberg, 1965, and Coopersmith, 1967). They are generally more effective and in general achieve more at a given level of intelligence than do persons who take a more negative view of themselves (Coopersmith, 1967).

In terms of effect, persons with high self concepts are generally more expressive, and are less likely to be rated as unhappy, destructive, shy, embarrassed or retiring (Diggory, 1966). They are less upset by the criticisms of others and more inclined to accept their own views of what is correct and appropriate (Coopersmith, 1967). Self expectations and the expectations of others exert a powerful influence upon the level of performance achieved (Diggory, 1966, and Rosenthal, 1964).

Higher estimates of power leads to higher expectations of success which appear to evoke greater efforts and focus eventuating in higher levels of performance. A positive attitude towards academic performance



can result in a fulfilled self-fulfilling prophecy of success (Rosenthal, 1964).

The research that is of particular importance to this paper deals with the influence of "significant others" on the self concept. At an early age, the most significant of "others" in the life of a child are his parents. How they help him grow and how they react to his exploratory experiences have tremendous influence on him. They are the first people to affect the development of his self concept and they continue to be influential as he grows older. However, there is a point during growth when friends and other people are recognized as powerful and influential. Friends and others will like, accept, and respect the child for what he is or is not. The significance and extent of the influence gradually shifts from the parents to these other persons. However parents remain influential. Significant others are the people who administer critical rewards and punishments in a person's life. Certainly teachers and administrators occupy this role. An individual's self concept is built from the many experiences with these significant other persons.

In a study by Ludwig and Maehr (1967) using 65 junior high students from age 12 to 14, the influence of significant others was tested and substantiated. These students performed various simple physical tasks in front of a physical development expert. The expert then uttered either approval or disapproval statements to the students at random irrespective of their performance. Tests of the students physical self concept, general self concept and their preferences for physical activities were administered prior to the evaluation by the experts and at various

intervals thereafter. Increases in self concept rating and in preference for directly related physical activities followed the approval treatment. A follow-up study by Haas and Maehr (1965) substantiated the results and also demonstrated the persistence of the changes over time.

In a study by Bachman, Secord and Peirce (1963), a self ascribed trait that each of 40 subjects believed a significant other person in their life would attribute to him was obtained. Also obtained was a trait that each subject believed a significant other person would not attribute to him. Strong pressure was then exerted towards changing these traits by means of a false personality assessment. A greater amount of change occurred in the low consensus traits, but the high consensus traits remained unchanged.

In a study by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), teachers were told that a special test had identified students in their classrooms that would demonstrate unusual growth during the school year. Students were then actually identified by random selection, but this fact was kept from the teachers. At the end of one year the randomly identified first grade students had gained an average of 27 I. Q. points.

The role of the school in the development and change of self concept is enormous. It dispenses praise and reproof, acceptance and rejection on a colossal scale. School provides not only the stage on which most of the drama of a student's formative years is played, but it also houses the most critical audience in the world - peers and teachers.  
(Hamachek, 1969, p. 8)

It is the position of this investigator that teachers teach what they are as well as what they know. Teachers, and more so administrators, through their influence on students, colleagues and parents from their

very significant positions, should themselves have high self concepts if they are to properly conduct their duties.

There are many different forms of self concept. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale attempts to measure the physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self and social self. Each of these is measured in terms of identity or what the person thinks he is, self satisfaction or his feelings about himself and behavior or how the person acts. Fitts et al. (1969) found a group of teachers low in physical self concept but high in family and moral-ethical self concept. In another study by the same group, teachers were found to be defensive (high self criticism) and rigid (low variability score).

Writing in 1952, John Brownfain examined the stability of the self concept.

The individual lacking self esteem is more likely to be "situation dominated". Uncertain about what to expect from the environment, his behavior becomes more dependent upon what he perceives as its demands. If the situation is favorable enough, his self esteem is inordinately heightened, but if the situation is unfavorable, self esteem is inordinately lowered. (Brownfain, 1965, p. 284)

Can a person's self concept be altered in a way to remain so over time by changing his situation? In 1964 Ashcraft and Fitts used psychotherapy to produce predictable changes in self concept. Taylor in 1955 had found similar results and Morse (1967) lowered already low self concepts by introducing a very socially desirable third person into an interview setting. However, Ashcraft and Fitts (1964) found no self concept change in 135 teachers after a two-week human relations laboratory but significant changes in 32 teachers in another of their studies.

Brooks (1968) using members of the Episcopal Church in a seven-day sensitivity training session found no change in self concept. Letner (1969) found no self concept change from group counseling using 41 prison inmates.

Norma Trowbridge (1970) compared the self concept of 94 teachers participating in a year-long in-service education session with another group just entering the program. Highly significant differences were found. However, the basic question remains unanswered. It seems that some types of situations contribute to self concept change and others do not. More is to be learned of the factors affecting self concept in specific situations. However, it can be concluded that self concept is changeable and if important in education, can possibly be adjusted to different levels within given individuals.

#### Self Concept and the Teacher

The fact that a student's self concept affects his learning is easy to establish, but the connection between the teacher's self concept and the student is not as clear. Arthur Combs felt that teachers, as well as children, behave according to the way they see themselves. If they have a strong concept of themselves as being capable, they will attempt new and challenging ventures, even those involving risks. If they do not see themselves as able to cope with new situations, they avoid taking responsibilities. Combs believed that teachers who felt that they were liked by their students would behave quite differently from those who felt they were disliked, and teachers who felt they were acceptable to the administration would behave quite differently from those who had serious

doubts about their acceptability. (Combs, 1965, p. 22)

Hamachek (1969) wrote eight general characteristics of a healthy self concept. Few would argue against them as being desirable qualities for teachers.

- (1) He is able to act on his own best judgment without feeling guilt or regretting his actions when others do not approve of what he's done.
- (2) He maintains confidence in his capacity to deal with problems even when setbacks and failures occur.
- (3) He feels equal, rather than superior or inferior to others as a person.
- (4) He assumes that he is a person of interest and value to others.
- (5) He can accept praise and compliments without embarrassment and with genuine appreciation.
- (6) He tends to resist the efforts of others, particularly peers, to dominate him.
- (7) He accepts and can admit he has, on different occasions, a wide range of impulses, feelings, desires, some of which are socially approved and some of which are not.
- (8) When he finds some aspect of behavior in himself he does not like because it is contrary to his self concept, he sets out to change it. (Hamachek, 1969, Pp. 8, 28)

It is not the intent of this investigation to contribute to the study of teacher effectiveness. An examination of the literature on the effectiveness of the teacher reveals disappointing results despite the great amount of effort. N. L. Gage reporting on a review of studies in the area of teacher effectiveness wrote:

In the large, these studies have yielded disappointing results: correlations that are non-significant; inconsistent from one study to the next and usually lacking in psychological and educational meaning. (Gage, 1963, p. 118)

In a later paper Gage (1965) considered why researchers continue to search for relationships with teacher effectiveness when their rewards are so meager. His tentative answer was because the need is so pressing. His literature review suggested five components to be researched: (1) warmth,

(2) cognitive organization, (3) orderliness, (4) indirectness and (5) problem-solving ability. It appears to this investigator that self concept is strongly related to one, four and five.

Zimiles et al. (1964) took the position that there is strong inter-connection between teaching and the functioning of the personality.

It is maintained that the personality of the teacher contributes not only to the social climate of the class and to the child's relatedness to adults, but to the teacher's own cognitive capacities as well, his curiosity and resourcefulness, the flexibility and originality of his thinking. (Zimiles et al. 1964, p. 105)

Perkins (1958) found that teachers who had taken certain courses in mental hygiene and child development were able to promote healthier personality growth in children. Healthy personality was defined in terms of the degree of congruence between the real self and the ideal self. McCallon (1966) using 47 fifth and sixth grade teachers from an urban school district concluded teachers who perceive themselves more favorably tend to perceive the students more favorably. Conversely, teachers who perceived themselves less favorably downgraded the less desirable students.

Seidman (1969) used 50 student-teachers in New York to study the relationship of teacher-talk and self concepts. She found a significant negative correlation between teacher-talk and self concept. She also concluded that high self concept student-teachers "manage" their classrooms less.

LaBenne and Greene (1969) found a highly significant relationship between teachers self concept and the pupil's perception of himself in the classroom. Stock (1949) found that when a person's feelings about himself changed, his attitude toward others changed in the same direction.

Esser (1969) used one-fourth of the elementary teachers in Lincoln, Nebraska to study the relationship between the teachers self concept and the principal's rating of teacher effectiveness. Teachers that had been persistently rated either "outstanding", "meets district standards", or "fair" by principals over the preceding five-year period were used. Esser concluded that the teacher's self concept and the principal's rating of performance were significantly related.

More than just a thread of evidence has emerged to warrant further investigation into the relationship between self concept and teachers. This investigation is planned to contribute to the knowledge about this relationship.

#### Self Concept and the School Administrator

Schools need to be administered in ways that will capitalize on the talents of all members of the staff. Campbell et al. (1965) stressed that methods must be employed to facilitate a wide range of participation in school policy decisions. A school administrator needs to understand more of the process in which he is involved. He needs more knowledge of himself and the effect he has on others. Writing in 1967 Campbell noted:

. . . if he (the school administrator) knows that in an organization there are both institutional and personal dimensions and that some conditions require emphasis on one, and different conditions require emphasis on the other, he may be one step ahead. Without some framework the superintendent is simply victim of all the forces about him and has no integrity of his own. (Campbell, 1967, p. 12)

There is agreement among social scientists that leadership is an important element in administrative behavior that encompasses both the

personal and organizational dimensions of the institution. Beal et al. (1962) wrote: "It is probable that without leadership no group can produce worthwhile action in the direction of its goals." (Beal et al., 1962, p. 31) Other authors have written on this point and research has been plentiful.

W. G. Miles, Jr. reviewed the literature concerning trait studies in management in 1968. He found mental ability the most frequent trait studied (nine times) and of significance (eight times). Other traits more related to self concept and personality were dominance (studied two times and found significant two times); super ego (studied two times and found significant two times); self confidence (studied two times and found significant two times); emotional stability (studied four times and found significant two times); and adjustment (studied once and found significant once). (Miles, 1968, p. 23)

McGrath and Altman (1966) after factor analysis of 30 small group studies, concluded that effective leadership was a function of intelligence, general ability, task ability and the level of formal education. Further, personality characteristics such as extroversion, assertiveness, and social maturity were found to be related to effective leadership behavior.

Katz and Kahn (1966) reasoned no difference between leadership and administration. For them leadership is situation specific and could occur anywhere on the continuum of organizational tasks. However, leadership at different points require different traits and skills and seeks different behavior.

White studied the personalities of educational administrators and



researchers in 1965 and then compared them with the general population and to each other. He concluded about the administrator:

A high degree of interest in people and in dealing with people, a relatively high intellectual ability, a concern for social norms, a high regard for exactness, a tendency to be concerned with practical, immediate needs rather than theoretical concerns, and a tendency toward conservatism along with a sensitivity to traditional ideas as opposed to radical "free thinking" would all appear, as this study suggests, to be closely related to satisfactorily fulfilling the administrative role. (White, 1965, p. 299)

Weiss (1968) found a positive significant relationship between job satisfaction and participation in decision making and that the magnitude of this relationship was tied to personality variables. Ford (1966) found that psychologically healthy elementary principals motivated teachers by personal example and their humanistic manner, didn't burden teachers with details and their schools had more open climates. Kline (1966) found a direct relationship between the consideration a curricular decision-maker showed his teachers and the extent to which his curricular plans and guides were used by the teachers in planning their instructional programs. Johnson et al. (1967) found a significant relationship between personality characteristics of superintendents and their willingness to accept and implement change in their schools.

Don Hamachek has frequently published on the topic of self concept, its relationship to personality and to education. Writing in 1966 he stated:

If a principal hopes to experience any success whatsoever in his role as decision-maker and change agent, he not only has to know something about the social setting and something about the principles of intervention and diagnoses, but he has to know something about himself - what he stands for and what he doesn't.

. . . you must define not only your educational and professional goals, but your personal goals. You must sort out who you are and what you believe in. In a word, you must define yourself to yourself or run the heavy risk of being tossed off course at the slightest change in the tides of public, staff, or student opinion. (Hamachek, 1966, p. 31)

A person's self concept reflects these qualities. Whether a person can maintain stability in imbalanced situations, whether a person is easily swayed from one position to another and other qualities already mentioned in this review are all important characteristics in school administrators and all are at least reflected in the self concept. Yet self concept has not been the subject of much investigation in educational administration.

Anton (1968) used an interview technique to study elementary principals in Montana. The self concept was inferred from the subjective judgment of the interviewer. The lower self concept principals had more tenure and stated a preference for taking care of detail. It was implied by Anton in the discussion of his study that to be an effective instructional leader, the principal must develop a positive (high) self concept.

Ross (1965) studied the self concept of 200 school superintendents from Class II and Class III high school systems from all areas in Nebraska but found no significant differences. He felt the data were such that similar studies should be conducted.

The problem of a valid and reliable measuring instrument of self concept has been a major one. Wylie (1961, p. 3) referred to the "bewildering array of hypotheses, instruments and designs used" in the study of self concept. The final section of the review will concern the Tennessee Self Concept Scale as an instrument now used widely that was not available when the Anton (1968) and Ross (1965) studies were done.

Whether administrators differ in self concept among themselves was an important consideration in this investigation and a number of factors were used to differentiate among the group of administrators tested. The previous studies of related factors that prompted this consideration are reviewed below.

Ferreira (1970) studied the administrative internship role and how interaction affected attitudes. One of his conclusions was ". . . the pressures of the role expectations of significant others are associated with change of intern's attitudes." (Ferreira, 1970, p. 86)

Fearning (1965) studied the role perception teachers have of the principal as compared with the perception the principal has of himself. He found them almost unrelated but recommended the topic as having great potential for further study. Carson and Schultz (1964) found similar results in a study of college deans.

Fleming (1967) found more innovation done during the first years in the principalship. Peach (1967) found a negative correlation between length of service, a positive correlation with recency of professional education, and the adaptiveness of the principal. Ramer (1968) studied the receptiveness of the superintendent towards innovation. He found significant relationships with length of service, amount of formal education, the size of the district, and open-mindedness. Miller (1969) investigated "risk takers" among school superintendents and found high risk takers had fewer years of experience, fewer years between the B.A. and M.A. degree, became superintendents earlier in their career path, made more moves as a superintendent and were then settled in larger communities. He found age not a factor. Holsclaw (1967) used the ratings

of superiors and subordinates to isolate factors of principal effectiveness. He found experience to be a factor but not academic preparation. Hemphill et al. (1962) found no correlation between the achievement of "in-basket" tasks and years in professional work, years in administration and years of academic preparation.

Gross and Herriott (1965) initiated a national study of the principalship in 1959, and devised an Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) scale to measure the conduct of the principal in his efforts to influence the behavior of teachers. Several of the findings of this study are of particular interest. There were highly significant relationships between the EPL score and the interpersonal skill of the principal also between the EPL and the superior's rating of the principal's interpersonal skill. There was a highly significant correlation between the perceived amount of teacher involvement in decision making and the EPL score. The greater the EPL score displayed by the principal's immediate superior, the greater the EPL of the principal. Negative correlations with EPL scores were found with graduate education hours, undergraduate education hours, educational administration hours, number of students, age, previous experience in education, experience as a principal, and experience in present position. The younger age at the time of the first principalship, the higher the EPL score. And finally the quality of college training was positively related to a high EPL score.

These studies prompted the inclusion of years of experience, recency of training, highest degree earned, years of experience, type of high school activity, number of students supervised, socio-economic level of

the parents, and the community setting for the position in this investigation. They have all been related to studies of the administrator in the past.

### The Measurement of Self Concept

In the preceding section Ruth Wylie was quoted as stating that the measurement of self concept was in a confused state in 1961. She also alluded to measurement difficulties resulting from vague theories and poorly defined terms and listed 98 instruments that had been devised and/or used to measure self concept.

For two-thirds of all instruments referred to in the table, no reliability information is available in published sources. For 80% of all instruments referred to in the table, no information on construct validity for inferring the phenomenal self is available in published sources. (Wylie, 1961, p. 86)

Wylie went on to conclude that studies had lacked content and replication and that most had attempted too global a measure. Under these circumstances, it was not surprising to find many different conclusions arising from the various studies she reviewed. The last edition of Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook (1965) did not review any instruments under the heading of self concept. In an Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development test review (1969) the reported instruments, when considered together, seemed consistent with Wylie's conclusion.

Very often a researcher of self concept develops his own measurement instrument. These are infrequently checked for any type of validity or reliability and are usually difficult to locate for review. Other researchers cannot replicate the study or use the instrument, in most

cases, because of these reasons. It is common, therefore, for a reported study of self concept to have used an instrument never used before and unlikely to be used again and this has presented a difficult problem.

In the Wylie review, the common methods of measuring self concepts were given as checklists, Q-sorts and self reports. She cited measurement error that can result from the use of such methods:

(1) the subject's intent to only selectively reveal information to the examiner; (2) the subject's intent to reveal things he does not have; (3) the subject's response habits and (4) a host of situational and methodological factors. (Wylie, 1961, p. 24) These can be summed into the problem of the "self report".

Combs et al. (1963) wrote on the problem of the self report in 1963. They argued that most of the studies purporting to explore the self concept are not studies of the self concept but rather of the self report. However, these findings supported the assumption that the self report was influenced by the self concept.

The Ross (1965) study followed the pattern set by most other self concept studies in that he used a measure that had not been used before nor has it been used since to the knowledge of this investigator. Ross used a semantic differential containing contrasts such as sweet-sour, kind-cruel, and hard-soft. He asked the superintendents in his sample to respond to these contrasts as "My Actual Self", "My Ideal Self", "Myself as a School Superintendent" and "The Ideal School Superintendent". Ross recommended a different instrument be found for future studies.

Stanley Coopersmith (1967) has developed a 50 item Self Esteem Inventory that is widely used. The scale purports to measure self

concept and is well normed. However, it is designed for use with grade school students only.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale, hereafter referred to as TSCS, has overcome some of the shortcomings of previous instruments. Authored by William H. Fitts, its development was begun in 1955 in an attempt to contribute to the self concept criterion problem in mental health research. The scale consists of 100 self descriptive items that are responded to with pencil by the examinee. Therefore this instrument does not overcome the problem of the self report.

However the TSCS has become widely used in contrast to most other instruments. Fitts reports over 200 articles and research studies using his instrument mostly done since 1965. In addition to this fact the measurement has been normed.

A broad sample of 626 people was used to create general norms for the instrument. The sample was drawn from across the country and across other important strata. The norms have not been revised since this initial sample was drawn; however, indications from other studies are that revision is not necessary. Other broad based populations have not differed from the original sample and the effects of various demographic variables has been negligible. The raw scores yield distributions that are approximately normal.

Test-retest reliability of the various subtests are approximately the same as those other measures that report such information. The same is true for validity data. The self concept is broken down on the TSCS from its usual global form as the counseling form of the test yields 14 subtest scores.

J. O. Crites reviewed the TSCS in 1965. His conclusion was generally favorable and called the validity data promising. However, he also commented on the self report feature, stating that the measure was non-phenomenological since the examinee cannot use his own words. A factor analysis by Vacchiano and Strauss in 1968 also substantiated the construct validity of the TSCS. Greenberg and Frank stated "the TSCS has much to recommend it as a useful clinical and research instrument". (Greenberg and Frank, 1965, p. 287)

The TSCS, then, is a frequently-used self concept measure as compared to others, has reliability and validity data equal to or superior to other instruments, has non-global subtests and is well normed. However it is a self report instrument with the shortcomings that feature implies.

### Summary

In this review the history of the concept of self was demonstrated with James (1890), then Allport (1937), Mead (1947), Freud (1935), Lewin (1936), Jung (1966), Symonds (1951), Rogers (1947), Snygg and Combs (1949), Sullivan (1953), Maslow (1962) and Wylie (1961). These authors lend a formidable array of expertise and reputation to the field.

Research on self concept had been slight until 1950 but considerable in amount since that time. Self concept has been associated with research in mental health, acceptance of others, creativity, confidence, interpersonal relations, performance, effectiveness, leadership, tension, anxiety, persuasibility and achievement. Self concept has been found



stable but changeable.

Self concept has been related directly and indirectly with teacher effectiveness. It has been reasoned that high self concept is a desirable trait for both teachers and school administrators. Administrator effectiveness was discussed in terms of personality study and also in relation to other factors found significant in other studies.

Finally, the problem of measuring the self concept was discussed, and three measurement scales were cited. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was explained and its wide use reviewed. Important factors of measurement and their relationship with the TSCS were discussed. It was concluded that the TSCS is an adequate measure of self concept.

## METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this chapter is to outline and explain the procedure used to implement this investigation. Information is given concerning the sample, the instrument used, collection of special data, the statistical techniques used and a detailed listing of the hypotheses.

The principal question in the investigation was "are teachers and administrators significantly different in self concept?" A sample of central Iowa teachers and administrators was selected, a self concept measuring device was chosen (the Tennessee Self Concept Scale hereafter referred to as the TSCS) and an analysis was made.

## The Sample

The data were gathered from three sources: (1) an in-service education agency in central Iowa named IMPACT, (2) a seminar on human relations for educational administrators at Iowa State University numbered Education 615E and (3) those in attendance at a three-day conference on administrator selection sponsored by Iowa State University. The sources yielded respondents with certain common characteristics. Each of the respondents had placed himself in a training setting and the training was known to be related to human relations. Most of the respondents were from the central Iowa region, and they were all aware that the data collected were to be used for research purposes.

The subjects from IMPACT were from three different sources: (1) the South Project subjects were teachers from the faculties of four Des Moines, Iowa schools that draw students from an area designated as disadvantaged;

(2) the 1970 Summer School subjects were teachers from throughout a nine-county area surrounding Des Moines; (3) the Leadership group was from the same nine-county area as the Summer School group but consisted of both teachers and administrators.

Project IMPACT has completed its third year of operation as a Title III program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and is now locally funded by the Polk County, Iowa, Board of Education. Its function was and is the in-service training of teachers and administrators in and around Polk County. Although the topics dealt with in IMPACT workshops varied, much time centered on the topics of creativity and a humanizing process for schools. The humanizing philosophy is concerned with interpersonal relations between students and teachers.

The South Project was an in-service education program for the Christ The King parochial school plus Howe and McKinley elementary public schools and Nathan Weeks Junior High School in Des Moines, Iowa. Christ The King serves grades one through eight, Howe and McKinley serve kindergarten through grade six, and Nathan Weeks serves grades seven through nine. The entire Christ The King, Howe and McKinley faculties were involved, but only the teachers of grade seven from Nathan Weeks. A series of workshops was conducted for these 47 teachers. The TSCS was administered on September 26, 1970, which was the date of the first meeting. Since many of the participants were also in later IMPACT groups used in this investigation, only 24 measures from this group were entered as data. All 24 measures were of classroom teachers. The program topics were humanizing and productive thinking.

The 1970 IMPACT Summer School was held at Olmsted Elementary School

in Urbandale, Iowa. The participants taught in various public and parochial schools in the nine-county area around Des Moines, Iowa, known as Area XI. The program topics for the Summer School were also humanizing and productive thinking. Participants were given instruction the first week of the five-week program, but only in the afternoons during the last four weeks. Students of all grade levels attended classes in the morning of the last four weeks which enabled the participants to try new teaching techniques. The participants were administered the TSCS on July 7, 1970, and 75 of these measures were included in the data. All the 75 were of teachers.

During the fall quarter of 1970, Richard Manatt conducted a seminar on human relations in educational administration at Iowa State University numbered 615E. The class consisted of two teachers, three principals, one superintendent, one central office administrator and one university administrator. Most of these people were from central Iowa. On September 15, 1970, they were administered the TSCS and the results became part of the data.

During the fall of 1970, IMPACT conducted leadership sessions for the schools in Area XI. Each of the 58 school districts was allowed to send two representatives to the sessions and 33 schools elected to do so. The group was split in half and identical sessions were held on the topics of humanizing and productive thinking for each group. The participants were to receive instruction on these topics and in turn conduct or lead sessions on them in their schools. The TSCS was administered on the opening dates of September 22 and 23, 1970. The group consisted of 35

teachers, 14 principals, eight central office administrators and one superintendent.

Each fall the College of Education at Iowa State University hosts a three-day conference on a selected topic for school administrators from central Iowa and beyond. In 1970 the topic of the conference was the selection and training of administrative personnel and was primarily treated from a humanized or interpersonal relations point-of-view. The TSCS was administered to this group on the opening day of the session, October 28, 1970. There were four teachers, one principal, six central office administrators, 67 superintendents and 14 "others" measured.

From these sources a total of 137 teachers, 68 superintendents, 36 principals and central office administrators and 21 "others" were measured. The measurement in the "other" category consisted primarily of university professors but also contained county and state education personnel. Those in the "other" category served in neither a teacher nor administrator capacity and were therefore not included in the data analysis.

#### The Tennessee Self Concept Scale

For the purpose of this study, self concept was operationally defined as the person's measured self-description as reported by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale developed by William Fitts. In discussing the scale, Fitts wrote:

Over recent years a wide variety of instruments has been employed to measure the self concept. Nevertheless, a need has continued for a scale which is simple for the subject, widely applicable, well standardized, and multi-

dimensional in its description of the self concept. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale . . . was developed to meet this need. (Fitts, 1965, p. 2)

In describing the scale, Fitts wrote of it consisting of:

. . . 100 self-descriptive statements which the subject uses to portray his own picture of himself. . . . It is also applicable to the whole range of psychological adjustment from healthy, well-adjusted people to psychotic patients. (Fitts, 1965, p. 2)

This scale was selected because it purports to measure the phenomenological self. The counseling form of the test consists of ten items taken from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory which are scored to form the "Self-Criticism" scale. The other 90 items were formed in the following manner.

. . . the first step was to compile a large pool of self-descriptive items. The original pool of items was derived from a number of other self-concept measures, including those developed by Balester (1956), Engel (1956), and Taylor (1953). Items were derived also from written self descriptions of patients and non-patients. After considerable study, a phenomenological system was developed for classifying items on the basis of what they themselves were saying. This evolved into the two-dimensional, 3 x 5 scheme employed on the Score Sheet. . . . After the items were edited, seven clinical psychologists were employed as judges to classify the items. . . . The final 90 items utilized in the Scale are those where there was perfect agreement by the judges. (Fitts, 1965, p. 1)

The time needed to complete the measure ranged from ten to 30 minutes. All scales were hand scored. The examinee could respond to each of the 100 items on a five point scale ranging from "completely false" to "completely true".

The norms were developed from a sample of 626 people from various parts of the country ranging in ages from 12 to 68. The subjects, taken from high school and college classes and other sources, were of both sexes,

negro and white, and represented all social, economic, intellectual and educational levels from the sixth grade to the Ph.D. The test-retest reliability coefficients of all major scores are given as a part of each sub-scale description below.

1. The self criticism sub-scale is composed of ten items that are mildly derogatory. Low self criticism is an indication of defensiveness, whereas a high score here generally indicates a normal, healthy openness and capacity for self criticism. (R. = .75)
2. Self Concept is the combined score on the following sub-scales. (R. = .91)
  - a. The Identity Score indicates "what I am". (R. = .91)
  - b. The Self-Satisfaction Score is an indication of self acceptance, or feeling about the self he describes. (R. = .88)
  - c. The Behavior Score is an index of how the person describes his action or "this is what I do". (R. = .88)
  - d. The Physical Self is the description of a person's feeling about his body, health, physical appearance, skills and sexuality. (R. = .87)
  - e. The Moral-Ethical Self is the self description of moral worth, relationship to God, and feelings of being a good or bad person. (R. = .80)
  - f. The Personal Self is a self description of worth or adequacy. (R. = .85)
  - g. The Family Self reflects the person's feeling of adequacy, worth and value as a family member. (R. = .89)
  - h. The Social Self reflects the perception a person has of himself in relation to others. (R. = .90)
3. The Variability score is the amount of variance in making the responses in the different categories and reflects rigidity and/or inconsistency. (R. = .67)
4. The Distribution score summarizes the examinees definiteness of response. (R. = .89)

Four kinds of validation procedures were used: (1) content validity, (2) discrimination between groups, (3) correlation with other personality measures, and (4) personality changes under particular conditions.

Content validity was established by the seven clinical psychologists as previously mentioned. Discrimination between groups was tested between a group of psychiatric patients and the norm group. Highly significant differences were found in all subscales except Self Criticism and Distribution.

Correlation data are given in the manual with scores on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Edwards Personal Preference Scale. They correlate in ways expected from the nature of the scores. Fitts reports three studies that indicate personality changes under certain conditions, and other studies have found valid changes in scores under prescribed conditions.

In the preceding chapter, research was cited that was done by Crites (1965), Vacchiano and Strauss (1968), Greenberg and Frank (1965) that contributes to the determination of validity. Because of the above evidence and its relatively wide usage, the TSCS was selected for this investigation.

#### Special Data

A Data Sheet (Appendix A) was completed by each administrator. This information was used to test the hypotheses concerning within group differences in level of overall self concept among administrators.

Information was collected under the following headings: Personal



History, Professional Training, Experience and Position. The data included sibling placement, extracurricular activities during high school, socio-economic level of the parents, highest degree held, amount of recent formal training, years' experience in present position, years' experience in similar positions, total experience in education, position title, number of students administered, whether the school was in a rural or urban setting, and to whom the administrator was responsible.

The data were tabled in raw form to enable the investigator to determine logical classification schemes. Care was taken to preserve differences through grouping while at the same time generating group sizes to accent the validity of an analysis of variance statistical test. The data from the last item concerning to whom the administrator was responsible were not used because this was reflected directly in the position the person held. Any differences could therefore be found in an analysis regarding position.

The information concerning sibling placement was collected because of the curiosity of the investigator. This curiosity centered about an intuitive hunch that this could affect self concept and that the oldest child had unique qualities when he became an administrator. The group was divided two ways: (1) eldest child against non-eldest and (2) the upper, middle or lower third of the sibling order. Each division resulted in near even distribution of the subjects.

Nearly 78 percent of the subjects listed athletics as their major extracurricular activity during high school. This group was tested against all other groups combined (music, seven; debate, one; none, ten;

music and debate, five).

The majority of the group (72 percent) also reported their parents in the middle socio-economic strata. This group was tested against all other groups combined (high, three and low, 26).

The information collected concerning degree was B.A., three; M.A., 56; Specialist, 28; Ed.D., seven; and Ph.D., 11. The B.A. and M.A. were combined as were the Ed.D. and Ph.D. so that three groups resulted.

In the study of the amount of recent training, one group was formed that earned no college credit work in the three years preceding data collection. A second group was formed with a one to six hour category, a third group with a seven to 18 hour category, and a fourth group having earned over 18 hours of college credit in the past three years.

The amount of experience reported in the present position was also divided into four groups. There were 25 administrators reporting fewer than two whole years in their present position, 33 between two and four years, 21 between five and seven years and 24 eight years or more.

Whether their current position was their first administrative position was reflected through the 23 subjects that reported no experience in similar positions. A second group was formed that reported one to ten years' experience in similar positions and a third group reporting 11 years or more. The subject's total years' experience in education was also divided into three groups; zero to 15 years' experience, 16 to 23 years' experience and 24 years' experience or more.

The number of students supervised by the administrator was also divided into three groups: zero students to 500, 501 to 1500, and over

1500. Some bias was suspected here for most principals fell in the first category. The final grouping was of the rural-urban data. Two groups were used; those school districts having a town of over 5,000 residents against those that did not.

All data were coded on standard coding forms and key-punched for processing. The programs of the Iowa State University Computation Center were used in the analysis.

### The Statistical Analysis

Two statistical techniques were used to test the hypotheses; the z-test for differences between means and the F-test within an analysis of variance. The z-test was used whenever the hypothesis concerned a comparison with the normed population and the F-test was used for other hypotheses. Although the analysis of variance was appropriate for all hypotheses, the data from the normed population included only means and standard deviations. This made it impossible to compute a useful within group sum of squares which is necessary for the analysis of variance technique.

Use of the z-test assumes the basic population distribution is normal (Hays, 1963, p. 305) and that the standard deviations of both populations are equal (Hays, 1963, p. 320). From the work Fitts did with the TSCS, he concluded ". . . all scales yield raw score distributions that conform fairly closely to the normal curve". (Fitts, 1965, p. 13) This provides significant evidence that the population of scores will approximate normality for each scale. In addition to this evidence,

it is well known that the assumption of normality can be violated for sufficiently large samples. The question of equal variance or standard deviations can be answered with similar logic. There was no reason to suspect that the variance within one group to be any different than within any other group. In repeated tests against the normed group, Fitts has not found sufficient evidence to change it. Therefore, the assumptions of normality and equal variance were met.

The use of the F distribution required a third assumption that the observations were independent (Hays, 1963, p. 349). Actually this assumption can be considered necessary for the t-distribution when used to test the difference between means. No known dependency of observations existed.

Two-tailed tests were used in all instances. Although the investigator suspected certain directional differences, a difference in either direction was of interest. Tables of means were computed to facilitate intuitive, non-statistical observations concerning the data.

### The Hypotheses

In chapter one the hypotheses were grouped under five main headings, but in total there were 48 hypotheses to be tested. The first 41 hypotheses were tested using the z-test of differences between means. Each of these hypotheses was tested using only two means. However, the last seven hypotheses needed more than two means to be tested so a one-way analysis of variance technique was used with the F-test.

1. There is no significant difference in measured self criticism between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.

2. There is no significant difference in measured identity self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
3. There is no significant difference in measured feeling self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
4. There is no significant difference in measured behavioral self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
5. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
6. There is no significant difference in measured physical self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
7. There is no significant difference in measured moral-ethical self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
8. There is no significant difference in measured personal self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
9. There is no significant difference in measured family self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
10. There is no significant difference in measured social self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
11. There is no significant difference in measured variability of self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS.
12. There is no significant difference in measured definiteness about self between the normed population and selected teachers using the TSCS. ♦
13. There is no significant difference in measured self criticism between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
14. There is no significant difference in measured identity self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.

15. There is no significant difference in measured feeling self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
16. There is no significant difference in measured behavioral self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
17. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
18. There is no significant difference in measured physical self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
19. There is no significant difference in measured moral-ethical self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
20. There is no significant difference in measured personal self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
21. There is no significant difference in measured family self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
22. There is no significant difference in measured social self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
23. There is no significant difference in measured variability of self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
24. There is no significant difference in measured definiteness about self between the normed population and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
25. There is no significant difference in measured self criticism between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
26. There is no significant difference in measured identity self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.

27. There is no significant difference in measured feeling self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
28. There is no significant difference in measured behavioral self between the selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
29. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
30. There is no significant difference in measured physical self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
31. There is no significant difference in measured moral-ethical self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
32. There is no significant difference in measured personal self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
33. There is no significant difference in measured family self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
34. There is no significant difference in measured social self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
35. There is no significant difference in measured variability of self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.
36. There is no significant difference in measured definiteness about self between selected teachers and selected school administrators using the TSCS.

The last 12 hypotheses deal only with the overall self concept which is compared with various other factors concerning public school administrators.

37. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school superintendents and other selected school administrators using the TSCS.

38. There is no significant difference in measured self concept among selected school administrators between eldest and non-eldest siblings.
39. There is no significant difference in measured self concept among selected school administrators between active participation in high school athletics and non-participation in high school athletics.
40. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning the social-economic level of their parents.
41. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning the rural-urban settings of their positions.
42. There is no significant difference in measured self concept among selected school administrators between position in the sibling order.
43. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning the highest college degree earned.
44. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning amount of recent college training.
45. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning years of experience in their present positions.
46. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning years of similar experience.
47. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning total years' experience in education.
48. There is no significant difference in measured self concept between selected school administrators concerning the number of students supervised.

The findings appear in the following chapter.



### Summary

This chapter explained the step-by-step procedure of the study in detail. The sample and its source were described. The characteristics of the subjects were outlined and the method of selection was examined.

The TSCS was reviewed in detail. Validity and reliability information was cited along with other strong and weak points of the instrument. The method of collecting special data was explained and the grouping of these data was outlined. The statistical techniques were reviewed and an explanation was offered concerning the needed assumptions. Finally the listing of all 48 hypotheses completed the chapter.

## FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Forty-eight specific hypotheses were listed in the preceding chapter. These same hypotheses were previously organized into four basic statements and presented in the Introduction. The 48 specific hypotheses can be divided into four groups of 12 each and thereby fit the basic grouping. Statistical tests of the data were designed to provide evidence for testing each of the 12 parts of each of the four basic groups and will be so presented in this chapter.

The data were obtained from 137 teachers and 104 school administrators in the manner described in the preceding chapter. Two devices were used to collect the data: (1) the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and (2) a special data sheet prepared to collect data for Hypotheses 37-48.

## Hypotheses Tested

The first 36 hypotheses were designed to be descriptive in nature. The norm group developed by Fitts (1965) for his TSCS was used to represent the general population and was compared with the scores of the teachers and administrators used in this investigation. The scores of the teachers and administrators were then compared with each other in the same manner.

Early examination of the data resulted in separation of the school superintendents from the group of school administrators for a comparison with the group of teachers. This provided a supplementary set of statistical tests for Hypotheses 25-48.

The TSCS is designed to measure the global self concept of an

individual and also to subdivide this global self concept into related parts. The "self concept" is subdivided into an identity self, feeling self and behavioral self. It is further subdivided into the physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self and social self. To give added insight for interpretation of the various scores, the TSCS also provides a means of estimating the respondent's self-criticism, his variability and his definiteness about the reported self concept.

Table 1 provides a listing of the mean scores of these 12 scales from

Table 1. Mean scores on the TSCS used in this investigation

Factors	Norm n=626	Teachers n=137	Adminis- trators n=104	Superin- tendents n=68
Self-criticism	35.54	35.01	36.45	35.99
Identity self	127.10	128.91	130.52	132.57
Feeling self	103.67	112.39	115.16	117.71
Behavioral self	115.01	116.99	120.11	122.76
Self concept	345.57	358.07	365.79	373.04
Physical self	71.78	70.66	72.64	74.34
Moral-ethical self	70.33	74.30	74.60	76.13
Personal self	64.55	68.05	71.04	73.09
Family self	70.83	74.92	75.42	75.26
Social self	68.14	70.37	72.11	73.26
Variability of self	48.53	40.39	37.73	35.15
Definiteness about self	120.44	118.46	125.36	130.01

the TSCS for the norm group, teachers, administrators and superintendents. Table 2 provides a listing of the standard deviations of the same scales for the same groups.

Table 2. The standard deviations of the TSCS factors used in this investigation

Factors	Norm	Teachers	Adminis- trators	Superin- tendents
Self-criticism	6.70	6.03	4.86	4.86
Identity self	9.96	9.11	10.29	9.25
Feeling self	13.79	12.82	14.84	15.19
Behavioral self	11.22	11.03	11.60	10.96
Self concept	30.70	29.31	32.88	32.29
Physical self	7.67	7.30	8.01	7.93
Moral-ethical self	8.70	6.64	8.07	7.62
Personal self	7.41	7.10	7.58	6.74
Family self	8.43	6.70	6.75	6.91
Social self	7.86	7.12	7.55	7.43
Variability of self	12.42	11.03	11.72	10.80
Definiteness about self	24.19	25.42	28.80	30.04

Hypotheses 37-48 dealt only with the "self concept" score within various arrangements of demographic data collected from the selected administrators. The attempt here was to isolate the source of variance for self concept among the school administrators tested. The school

superintendents were separated from the other administrators in an attempt to isolate sources of self concept variance within this group. Personal history, experience, training and school factors were used in this attempt.

### Hypotheses 1-12

Hypotheses 1-12 can be summarized under one statement in the null form.

There is no significant difference between the general population and selected teachers in:

1. self-criticism
2. identity self
3. feeling self
4. behavioral self
5. self concept
6. physical self
7. moral-ethical self
8. personal self
9. family self
10. social self
11. variability of self
12. definiteness about self

The z-test was used to test the significance of the mean differences and are reported in Table 3. Values for z of 1.96 and 2.56 were needed for five and one percent significance levels respectively.

The teachers were found to have significantly different scores than the norm group on most factors of the TSCS. The teachers were also less variable in reporting their self but nearly the same in self-criticism and definiteness. Null hypotheses 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 were rejected in this investigation.

Table 3. Tests of the significant differences between the means of the norm group and selected teachers on factors of the TSCS

Factors	Norm n=626	Teachers n=137	z-values
Self-criticism	35.54	35.01	- .95
Identity self	127.10	128.91	2.07*
Feeling self	103.67	112.39	7.11**
Behavioral self	115.01	116.99	1.83
Self concept	345.57	358.07	4.48**
Physical self	71.78	70.66	-1.61
Moral-ethical self	70.33	74.30	5.97**
Personal self	64.55	68.05	5.19**
Family self	70.83	74.92	6.16**
Social self	68.14	70.37	3.26**
Variability of self	48.53	40.39	-7.64**
Definiteness about self	120.44	118.46	- .83

\* Significant at the 5 percent level.

\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

#### Hypotheses 13-24

Hypotheses 13-24 can also be summarized under one statement in the null form.

There is no significant difference between the general population and selected administrators in:

13. self-criticism
14. identity self

- 15. feeling self
- 16. behavioral self
- 17. self concept
- 18. physical self
- 19. moral-ethical self
- 20. personal self
- 21. family self
- 22. social self
- 23. variability of self
- 24. definiteness about self

Again the z-test was used to test the significance of the mean differences and the results are reported in Table 4. Values for z of 1.96 and 2.56 were needed for five and one percent significance levels respectively.

The administrators were found to be even more different from the norm group than were the teachers. In addition to the factors already reported as significantly different for the teachers, the behavioral self can be reported for the administrators. However, the factors of physical self, self-criticism and definiteness did not differ significantly from the norm group. This investigation rejected null hypotheses 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 based on the considerations of this investigation.

#### Hypotheses 25-36

Hypotheses 25-36 can also be summarized under one statement in the null form.

There is no significant difference between selected teachers and selected administrators in:

- 25. self-criticism
- 26. identity self
- 27. feeling self

Table 4. Tests of the significant differences between the means of the norm group and selected administrators on factors of the TSCS

Factors	Norm n=626	Adminis- trators n=104	z-values
Self-criticism	35.54	36.45	1.67
Identity self	127.10	130.52	3.15**
Feeling self	103.67	115.16	7.38**
Behavioral self	115.01	120.11	4.17**
Self concept	345.57	365.79	5.86**
Physical self	71.78	72.64	1.02
Moral-ethical self	70.33	74.60	5.71**
Personal self	64.55	71.04	8.11**
Family self	70.83	75.42	6.18**
Social self	68.14	72.11	4.93**
Variability of self	48.53	37.73	-8.63**
Definiteness about self	120.44	125.36	1.65

\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

- 28. behavioral self
- 29. self concept
- 30. physical self
- 31. moral-ethical self
- 32. personal self
- 33. family self
- 34. social self
- 35. variability of self
- 36. definiteness about self

Again the z-test was used to test the significance of the mean



differences and the results are reported in Table 5. Values for  $z$  of 1.96 and 2.56 were needed for five and one percent significance levels respectively.

There was considerable difference in the result of these tests and those already reported. Self concept scores were not found to be

Table 5. Tests of the significant differences between the means of selected teachers and selected administrators on factors of the TSCS

Factors	Teachers n=137	Adminis- trators n=104	z-values
Self-criticism	35.01	36.45	2.05*
Identity self	128.91	130.52	1.26
Feeling self	112.39	115.16	1.69
Behavioral self	116.99	120.11	2.11*
Self concept	358.07	365.79	1.89
Physical self	70.66	72.64	1.97*
Moral-ethical self	74.30	74.60	.32
Personal self	68.05	71.04	3.12**
Family self	74.92	75.42	.65
Social self	70.37	72.11	1.82
Variability of self	40.39	37.73	-1.79
Definiteness about self	118.46	125.36	1.94

\* Significant at the 5 percent level.

\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

significantly different between the administrators and teachers although the behavioral self, physical self and personal self were found significantly different. The physical self had not been found significantly different on the two previous tests. Self-criticism was found significantly higher and this had not been found significantly different in previous comparisons.

To explore this further, Hypothesis 37 was tested and the selected superintendents were found significantly different than the other selected administrators (Table 8). Further analyses of Hypotheses 25-36 were then conducted. A new set of z-tests was made using only the superintendent category from the group of selected administrators. The results of these tests are reported in Table 6.

The results of these tests are more consistent with the tests of Hypotheses 1-24. The superintendents' scores did differ significantly from the teachers in self concept, identity self, feeling self, behavioral self, physical self, personal self, and social self. There was no significant difference found in the self-criticism scores, but scores on the variability and definiteness scales did differ significantly.

#### Summary of Hypotheses 1-36

The main purpose of Hypotheses 1-36 was to describe the difference in self concept between the general population, teachers and school administrators. Table 7 summarizes the significant differences that were found.

Differences in self concept, identity self, feeling self, behavioral

Table 6. Tests of the significant differences between the means of selected teachers and selected superintendents on factors of the TSCS

Factors	Teachers n=137	Superin- tendents n=68	z-values
Self-criticism	35.01	35.99	1.25
Identity self	128.91	132.57	2.68**
Feeling self	112.39	117.71	2.48*
Behavioral self	116.99	122.76	3.54**
Self concept	358.07	373.04	3.22**
Physical self	70.66	74.34	3.21**
Moral-ethical self	74.30	76.13	1.38
Personal self	68.05	73.08	4.95**
Family self	74.92	76.26	1.32
Social self	70.37	73.26	2.73**
Variability of self	40.39	35.15	-3.24**
Definiteness about self	118.46	130.01	2.72**

\* Significant at the 5 percent level.

\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

Table 7. Significant mean differences found in this investigation

TSCS factors	Teachers vs Norm	Adminis- trators vs Norm	Teachers vs Adminis- trators	Teachers vs Superin- tendents	Adminis- trators vs Superin- tendents
Self-criticism	NS <sup>a</sup>	.10	.05	NS	NT <sup>b</sup>
Identity self	.05	.002	NS	.01	NT
Feeling self	.002	.002	.10	.05	NT
Behavioral self	.10	.002	.05	.002	NT
Self concept	.002	.002	.10	.002	.002
Physical self	NS	NS	.05	.002	NT
Moral-ethical self	.002	.002	NS	NS	NT
Personal self	.002	.002	.002	.002	NT
Family self	.002	.002	NS	NS	NT
Social self	.002	.002	.10	.01	NT
Variability of self	.002	.002	.10	.002	NT
Definiteness about self	NS	.10	.10	.01	NT

<sup>a</sup> NS = Not significant.

<sup>b</sup> NT = Not tested.

self, personal self, social self and the variability of the reported self were all found consistently significant in the various tests. Table 1 also illustrates a consistent change in the means of the various self concept factors.

### Hypotheses 37-48

Hypotheses 37-48 were made in an attempt to isolate the source of variance of the self concept among the selected school administrators. It was assumed that one or more of the demographic variables listed below might account for any differences in self concept found in this investigation. These hypotheses can also be summarized under one statement in the null form.

There is no significant difference in overall self concept among school administrators and:

37. type of position
38. eldest sibling
39. high school activities
40. parent's socio-economic level
41. school setting
42. sibling placement
43. highest degree earned
44. recent college training
45. years experience in position
46. years of similar experience
47. years experience in education
48. number of students supervised.

The z-test was used when the factors under consideration were divided into two groups. The analysis of variance with the F-scale was used when three or more groups were considered. Tables 8 and 9 summarize the results of these tests.

This investigation failed to reject any of the hypotheses except

Table 8. Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected administrators on self concept regarding various other factors

Factors	Means	Mean differences	z-value
Type of position			
Superintendent	373.04 (68)		
Other administrators	352.08 (36)	20.66	3.29**
Sibling placement			
Eldest	368.79 (46)		
Non-eldest	364.93 (58)	3.86	.61
Active participation in high school activities			
Athletics	365.34 (80)		
Other activities	370.96 (24)	5.62	.88
Socio-economic level of the parents			
Middle	367.07 (74)		
Non-middle	365.57 (30)	1.51	.21
School setting			
Rural	367.75 (60)		
Urban	363.25 (44)	4.40	.69

\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

Table 9. Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected administrators on self concept regarding various factors

Factors	Means	N	Degrees of freedom	F-value
Sibling placement				
Upper third	363.52	30	2	.53
Middle third	370.64	39		
Lower third	364.06	35		
Highest earned degree				
B.A. or M.A.	360.49	56	2	1.97
Specialist	373.43	30		
Ed.D. or Ph.D.	372.72	18		
Recent graduate hours of training				
None	377.17	19	3	1.94
1-6	361.11	27		
7-18	355.76	21		
18+	371.05	37		
Years of tenure in position				
0-1	374.69	26	3	1.54
2-4	360.82	33		
5-7	358.30	21		
8+	371.83	24		
Years of similar experience				
None	365.32	23	2	.69
1-10	370.39	46		
11+	361.83	35		
Total years experience in education				
0-15	371.88	39	2	.95
16-23	362.13	46		
24+	365.26	19		
Number of students supervised				
0-500	370.19	27	2	.41
501-1500	362.66	35		
1501+	367.10	41		

number 37. The highly significant difference found between the scores of the superintendents and the scores of the other administrators prompted a new set of tests for Hypotheses 25-36 and also for Hypotheses 37-48.

The superintendents were separated from the other administrators and another set of tests was conducted just for this group. The results are found in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10. Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected superintendents on self concept regarding various factors

Factors	Means	Mean differences	z-value
Sibling placement			
Eldest	376.15 (27)		
Non-eldest	371.00 (41)	5.15	.66
Active participation in high school activities			
Atheletics	372.80 (54)		
Other activities	374.00 (14)	1.20	.13
Socio-economic level of the parents			
Middle	376.70 (47)		
Non-middle	364.86 (21)	11.96	1.39
School setting			
Rural	376.00 (42)		
Urban	368.27 (26)	7.73	1.02

Although a significant difference in self concept was found in the total years of experience in education for the superintendents, for all practical purposes the source of the variance was not isolated and the



Table 11. Tests of the significant differences between the means among selected superintendents on self concept regarding various factors

Factors	Means	N	Degrees of freedom	F-value
Sibling placement				
Upper third	367.76	17	2	.41
Middle third	376.78	28		
Lower third	372.39	23		
Highest earned degree				
B.A. or M.A.	369.07	29	2	.46
Specialist	374.21	24		
Ed.D. or Ph.D.	378.87	15		
Recent graduate hours of training				
None	378.06	16	3	1.23
1-6	369.61	18		
7-18	359.25	12		
18+	379.73	22		
Years of tenure in position				
0-1	390.91	12	3	2.03
2-4	370.91	23		
5-7	360.43	14		
8+	373.63	19		
Years of similar experience				
None	381.40	10	2	3.04
1-10	380.80	30		
11+	361.75	28		
Total years experience in education				
0-15	387.91	22	2	3.67*
16-23	366.20	30		
24+	365.44	16		
Number of students supervised				
0-500	390.78	9	2	1.56
501-1500	370.36	28		
1501+	370.32	31		

\* Significant at the 5 percent level.

tests failed to reject Hypotheses 38-48.

Even though only one significant F-value was found in Tables 9 and 11, further testing of the means seemed warranted. For example, in Table 11, factor "Recent graduate hours of training" shows an interesting pattern of the means. The "none" group mean appears to be quite different from the "7-18" group mean and likewise the "1-6" group mean appears quite different from the "18+" group. However, the fact that the means begin and end at about 378 neutralizes any overall effect these differences might otherwise exhibit.

When considering the means two at a time, a number of additional comparisons are possible. Such a set of comparisons might have revealed significant differences between pairs of means that would have revealed possible sources of self concept variance not revealed by the overall analysis of variance technique.

For factor "Recent graduate hours of training" group one could have been compared separately with groups two, three, and four; group two could have been compared separately with group three and four; and group three could have been compared with group four.

A method has been developed by Scheffe (Hays, 1963; Pp. 484-485) for making such comparisons. Scheffe's test was used to further analyze all the data presented in Tables 9 and 11 using a 95 percent level of significance. No significant differences were found.

The Scheffe test is a conservative one and is recommended for use only when a significant F-value is found. However, it was used here even though no significant F-values were found as another attempt to isolate

the variance of self concept among the selected administrators tested.

#### TSCS Item Analysis

To further search for clues as to the source of self concept variance among the selected administrators, an item analysis of the TSCS was conducted. It was reasoned that those items showing general agreement among respondents would better describe their view of self and those items showing general disagreement could give clues for further attempts to locate the source of self concept variance.

Since the superintendent category of the administrator group demonstrated more power in the investigation of previous hypotheses, only the superintendent category was analyzed. An arbitrary standard was used to separate the items into two groups. Group one (Table 12) consists of those items wherein 75 percent or more of the superintendents marked either (1) completely true or mostly true or (2) completely false or mostly false. This standard provides a group of items having a response pattern reflecting a high degree of consensus among the superintendents. Sixty-three of the 100 items met this criteria and are listed in Table 12.

Twenty-four of the 30 items comprising the identity self are in Table 12. Also 16 of the 30 feeling self items and 19 of the 30 behavioral self items. Ten of the 18 items for physical self, 13 of the 18 moral-ethical self items, 12 of the 18 personal self items, 14 of the 18 family self items and 9 of the 18 social self items.

The greatest consistency was displayed in items appearing in both the following subscale pairs: identity and physical self; identity and

Table 12. Items of the TSCS showing consistent response patterns of selected school superintendents

---

I have a healthy body.	I don't feel as well as I should.
I consider myself a sloppy person.	I wish I could be more trustworthy.
I am a decent sort of person.	I shouldn't tell so many lies.
I am an honest person	I am not the person I would like to be.
I am a bad person.	I am too sensitive to things my family say.
I am a cheerful person	I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.
I am a nobody	At times I feel like swearing.
I have a family that would help me in any kind of trouble.	I try to be careful about my appearance.
I am a member of a happy family.	I often act like I am "all thumbs".
My friends have no confidence in me.	I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.
I am a friendly person.	I do things without thinking about them first.
I am popular with men.	I try to play fair with my friends and family.
I do not always tell the truth.	I take a real interest in my family.
I get angry sometimes.	I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.
I like to look nice and neat all the time.	I get along well with other people.
I am full of aches and pains.	I would rather win than lose a game.
I am a sick person.	I feel good most of the time.
I am a moral failure.	I do what is right most of the time.
I am a morally weak person.	I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead.
I have a lot of self-control.	I have trouble doing the things that are right.
I am a hateful person.	I solve my problems quite easily.
I am losing my mind.	I change my mind a lot.
I am an important person to my friends and family	I try to run away from my problems.
I am not loved by my family.	I do my share of work at home
I feel that my family doesn't trust me.	I quarrel with my family.
I am mad at the whole world.	I do not act like my family thinks I should.
I am satisfied with my moral behavior.	I find it hard to talk with strangers.
I am satisfied with my relationship to God.	
I am satisfied to be just what I am.	
I despise myself.	
I am satisfied with my family relationships.	
I should trust my family more.	
I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.	
I am no good at all from a social standpoint.	
Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.	
I am neither too tall nor too short.	

---

moral-ethical self; identity and personal self; identity and family self; feeling and moral-ethical self; behavioral and personal self; behavioral and family self.

Some items received single response marking to a very high degree of consistency.

I am a sick person.	88 percent completely false
I am losing my mind.	91 percent completely false
I am not loved by my family.	88 percent completely false
I feel that my family doesn't trust me.	85 percent completely false
I am mad at the whole world.	85 percent completely false
I am a bad person.	73 percent completely false
I am a nobody.	76 percent completely false
I am a moral failure.	73 percent completely false
I despise myself.	70 percent completely false
I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.	72 percent completely true
I would rather win than lose a game.	74 percent completely true
I take a real interest in my family.	66 percent completely true

Group two of the items (Table 13) is made up of those items where the response patterns did not exhibit a high degree of consistency. Examination of the content of these items could uncover a potential source of variance to be examined in future studies of this type.

Thirty-seven of the 100 items appear in Table 13. Only six of the 30 identity self items appear in this table, 14 of 30 feeling self items and 11 of 30 behavioral self items. Eight of the 18 physical self items, six of the 18 personal self items, four of 18 family self items and nine of 18 social self items.

The least consistency was found in the following pairs of TSCS subscales: identity and social self; feeling and physical self; feeling and social self; behavioral and physical self; and behavioral and social

Table 13. Items of the TSCS not showing consistent response patterns by selected school superintendents

---

I am an attractive person.	I do poorly in sports and games.
I am a calm and easy going person.	I am a poor sleeper.
I am not interested in what other people do.	I see good points in all the people I meet.
I am a religious person.	I do not feel at ease with other people.
I am popular with women.	Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
I am hard to be friendly with.	
Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.	
Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.	
I am neither too fat nor too thin.	
I like my looks just the way they are.	
I would like to change some parts of my body.	
I ought to go to church more.	
I am just as nice as I should be.	
I understand my family as well as I should.	
I am as sociable as I want to be.	
I do not like everyone I know.	
I should have more sex appeal.	
I am as religious as I want to be.	
I am as smart as I want to be.	
I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.	
I treat my parents as well as I should.	
I should love my family more.	
I should be more polite to others.	
I ought to get along better with other people.	
I gossip a little at times.	
I take good care of myself physically.	
I am true to my religion in my everyday life.	
I sometimes do very bad things.	
I can always take care of myself in any situation.	
I take the blame for things without getting mad.	
I give in to my parents.	
I do not forgive others easily.	

---

self items.

Those single items receiving the least consistent marks are given below.

I am a calm and easy going person.  
I am not interested in what other people do.  
I am hard to be friendly with.  
Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.  
I am neither too fat nor too thin.  
I would like to change some parts of my body.  
I ought to go to church more.  
I am just as nice as I should be.  
I should have more sex appeal.  
I am as smart as I want to be.  
I should be more polite to others.  
I gossip a little at times.  
I sometimes do very bad things  
Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

The complete item analysis appears in Appendix B.

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Summary

The role of the teacher is a unique one. Teachers play a large part in the development of children and their adjustment to adult society. They have a close and lasting contact with many children for the express purpose of helping them adjust to their place in this society. This is a responsible position that requires a stable person who understands himself so that he may accept and understand the children he must help. This is an emotionally charged role that requires the teacher, as the adult image, to remain calm and exhibit those qualities he wishes to instill in the children.

What can be said of the teacher can also be said for the administrator. His responsibility is spread over many classes of children and over many teachers. He must be even more stable and aware of his "self". In his relationships with children, parents and teachers he must set a high standard of what society desires to be the product of the schools.

The self concept of the teacher and the administrator should be high. The main question of this study was: are they high? Logically, both groups should differ from the general population in their level of self concept; they should be higher. Logically also administrators should differ from teachers, and under different circumstances, might differ from each other.

In preceding sections the hypotheses of this investigation have been stated in the null form. However, for purposes of this summary they are



now stated in the question form.

There were four basic questions in this investigation.

1. Do teachers differ in self concept from the general population?
2. Do school administrators differ in self concept from the general population?
3. Do teachers differ in self concept from school administrators?
4. How do school administrators differ in self concept from each other?

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) authored by William Fitts was selected as the best available device to measure self concept. A norm group representing the general population was available for this scale and was used in this investigation to represent the general population. One hundred thirty seven teachers and one hundred four school administrators were selected from various sources in central Iowa to serve as a sample.

Twelve subscales of the TSCS were examined to provide a more detailed view of the self concept. The scales of self-criticism, identity self, feeling self, behavioral self, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, social self, variability of self, and definiteness about self were all used in addition to the overall self concept. These twelve subscales were used as part of each of the first three questions to make a total of thirty-six hypotheses.

The teachers were found to be significantly higher in self concept than the general population. The administrators were found significantly higher in self concept than the general population also. The administrators and particularly the superintendents were found significantly higher

in self concept than the teachers.

Twelve demographic factors and the overall self concept scores on the TSCS were used in an attempt to answer the fourth question. The only significant result found in the initial analysis of the fourth question was that superintendents differed in self concept from other administrators. Following this lead the superintendents were separated from the other administrators and another analysis of the twelve demographic factors was made using just the superintendent category. Only "Total years experience in education" was found to show significant differences among the twelve factors considered.

To further investigate possible answers to this question an item analysis of the TSCS was made for the superintendent category. Some interesting possible avenues for future investigation were uncovered.

#### Interpreting the TSCS scores

The self concept scale of the TSCS is the most important single scale on the instrument. It reflects the overall combined feeling of self esteem. The physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self are all adequately explained by their respective definitions as given on page nine. The sum of these scores must equal the overall self concept.

The identity self scale reflects the basic identity of the individual as he sees it. The respondent indicates what he is in his own perception within the self report framework provided by the TSCS. The feeling self scale reflects the level of satisfaction the individual has for his self the way he perceives it to be. The level of feeling or satisfaction can

be different from the perceived self. The behavioral self scale reflects the way the individual acts. A well-integrated individual should score each dimension consistent with the others. The sum of these three dimensions must also equal the overall self concept.

The variability score reflects how differently the above scales were scored by the individual. High variability means large differences in the way a person perceives himself to be, his satisfaction with it or his actions. The definiteness scale reveals how firm the individual was in making his various responses. High scores indicate more definite response patterns.

The self-criticism scale consists of mildly derogatory statements that most people would admit as being true for them. Individuals are defensive if they are unwilling to admit to these statements or defenseless if they are too agreeable. Only extreme scores on this scale have great meaning.

#### Question one

"Do teachers differ in self concept from the general population?"

The twelve subscales of the TSCS formed the first twelve hypotheses in the attempt to answer question one. Highly significant differences were found favoring a conclusion that the teachers used in this investigation were significantly higher in self concept than the general population as represented by the norm group of the TSCS.

A case built on logic has been developed which concludes teachers should have higher self concepts than the general population. To the extent that these selected teachers represent all teachers, that the TSCS

accurately measures self concept and that the norm group does reliably represent the general population, this has been demonstrated as being true.

The teachers were significantly higher in their overall self concept, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self and social self. A more realistic appraisal of self is demonstrated by a higher identity self score. A comfortable acceptance of this appraisal is indicated by the high feeling self scores. The teachers reported their self concept in a significantly more consistent fashion as is reflected in a lower variability score.

With the exception of the dimension of physical self, the teachers understand themselves, are satisfied with this understanding but do not necessarily act in any way different about it than the general population. Their scores were less variable, thus reflecting better integration of the different self concept dimensions. In general the answer to question one is "yes".

#### Question two

"Do school administrators differ in self concept from the general population?"

To the extent that these administrators represent all administrators, that the norm group represents the general population and that the TSCS accurately measures self concept, the answer to question is also "yes". The administrators used in this investigation exhibited an even more consistent and better integrated pattern of responses than did the teachers when compared with the norm group.

A case built on logic has been presented which concludes that administrators should also be different in self concept from the general population. This logic was upheld under the limitations of this investigation.

The administrators were significantly higher than the norm group in overall self concept, identity self, feeling self, behavioral self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self. The physical self scores were not found to be significantly different. The level of difference was stronger for the administrators than it had been for the teachers. The behavioral self dimension, which had not been found significantly different for teachers, was found to be significantly different for administrators.

Like teachers, the administrators were significantly lower in their variability of reported self. The administrators apparently understand themselves, are satisfied with this understanding and act accordingly. The extent of this understanding and satisfaction is greater than that of the general population.

### Question three

"Do teachers differ in self concept from school administrators?"

The results of the tests made to answer this question were not as clear as was the case for questions one and two. Although significant differences were found, they seemed inconsistent and scattered. The personal self dimension was found significantly different as before but no other consistencies were noted. Self-criticism and physical self were found significantly different in this test but they had not been found so

in previous tests.

The administrator group contained 68 superintendents which comprised 65 percent of the group. Considering the potential importance of this fact the superintendents were contrasted to the remaining administrators using their overall self concept scores. The difference in means was found highly significant and accordingly, the superintendents were separated from the administrator group.

Restating question three to read "Do teachers differ in self concept from school superintendents?" a new set of tests was conducted contrasting the teachers and the superintendents using all twelve TSCS factors. To the extent that the teachers used in this investigation represent all teachers, that the superintendents represent all superintendents and that the TSCS accurately measures self concept the answer to this question is "yes".

Differences consistent with those previously found resulted from these tests. Most dimensions of self concept were found significantly higher. The superintendents were less variable and more definite about their reported self.

#### Question four

"How do school administrators differ in self concept from each other?"

Twelve categories of the demographic data collected were analyzed and only one category yielded a significant difference in overall self concept among administrators. In the "position" category superintendents were found to differ significantly from other administrators. On the basis of this finding, question four was reworded in the form found below.

How do school superintendents differ in self concept from each other? The same twelve categories of demographic data were analyzed to answer this question. Only "Total years experience in education" was found to have significant differences and this category yielded high self concept means in favor of less experience.

Seventy-eight percent of the administrators in the sample reported that they had been active in athletics in high school. Seventy-two percent of the administrators reported themselves as having a middle class background. These two facts are interesting, but no known importance can be attached to them.

It is also interesting to note that in two categories the demographic data exhibited high levels of self concept for the first sub-category, went down for middle sub-categories and then back up again for the last sub-category. The two categories were "Recent graduate hours of training" and "years of tenure in position". It appears that the person has a high self concept as he begins his career or graduate program, goes down as he gets into them, and then back up as he grows accustomed to them.

The item analysis of the TSCS for the superintendents also yielded some interesting results. The superintendents responded with high consistency on items relating to identity, family, morals and their personal self. They responded with low consistency on items relating to their feelings and their social self.

### Self concept dimensions

The dimensions of self concept have been outlined in this chapter as the subscales of the TSCS. Each dimension was contrasted four ways: the teachers against the norm group; the administrators against the norm group; the administrators against the teachers; and the superintendents against the teachers. The findings will be summarized again in this section only this time by self concept dimension.

The least change among all contrasts was with the self-criticism score means. The only significant difference noted was between teachers and administrators. Since the most meaning for this dimension has been described as in the extreme ranges, a note of psychological health is made here.

The identity self dimension was found significantly different in three of the four contrasts. In each case the direction of the difference was as expected, first in favor of the teachers and then for the superintendents. Since this reflects "what I am" it is an important dimension as it is a principal part of one's understanding of one's self.

The feeling self dimension was also found significantly different for three of the four contrasts, in each case in favor of the expected group. This reflects the psychological satisfaction the teachers and administrators report for themselves in the identity self dimension.

The behavioral self dimension was found significantly different for three of the four contrasts, in each case in favor of the expected group. This reflects on the actions of the teachers and administrators and whether they behave in accordance with their reported selves. They seem



to do so.

The physical self was not found to be significantly different for either the teachers or the administrators when compared with the norm group, but was found to be significantly higher for both the administrators and the superintendents when compared with the teachers. The opposite of this situation occurred for moral-ethical self and family self. Perhaps the male - female distribution could explain part of this. American women are often perceived as being more ethical and more family conscious than the American male.

The personal self dimension was found to be significantly different in all four contrasts. By definition this reflects the person's sense of adequacy and worth. A plausible explanation of this lies in the relative authority position of the teacher, administrator and superintendent. All three positions are relatively high in authority which could explain part of this difference.

The social self dimension was found significantly different in three of the four contrasts. Since this reflects the person's sense of adequacy and worth in social interaction, the relative authority of each position could have tempered the respondent's perceptions and help account for the reported difference here.

The variability of the reported self reflects the degree of integration over the different dimensions of self concept. The teachers and administrators were reported as being better integrated in this sense than the norm group and likewise the superintendents over the teachers. These directions were expected.

Finally the superintendents demonstrated more definiteness than the teachers. The superintendents responded in a more concise and definite manner than did the teachers. This is consistent with their role as decision makers in schools.

### Limitations

The teachers and school administrators used in this investigation were not drawn at random, therefore the findings of this investigation are limited to conclusions about these teachers and administrators only. The sample was drawn in this fashion primarily because of the complex response form of the TSCS.

The TSCS was constructed for ease of scoring. The response sheet covers a carbon sheet which in turn covers the scoring sheet. The subject's responses are thereby marked on the scoring sheet by means of the carbon. To accomplish ease of scoring, Fitts arranged the items out of order. For example, page one in the scale booklet contains items one, three, five, nineteen, twenty-one, twenty-three and other numbers in an equally unusual order. Further adding to this confusion, responses to these items are recorded in the column of the response sheet on the far right side and in every other blank. Although Fitts contends the instrument is self administering, this investigator concludes to the contrary. The means of responding described above is confusing, but by a face-to-face administration, errors resulting from it can be minimized.

On the TSCS response sheets collected for this investigation, 190 or 78 percent of the respondents made errors in recording their initial

responses. This substantiates the claim that the TSCS response mode is confusing for self administration. However, the face-to-face administration used in this investigation aided the respondents and errors were corrected.

The conclusions of this investigation are also limited to the self concept as determined by the TSCS. Self concept might be defined by stating that it is what a self concept scale measures. The difficulty of measuring self concept is documented in the review of literature of this investigation. Summarizing the section on self concept measurement, the TSCS was judged to be the superior of existing self concept measurement instruments. A self report instrument limits the report to what the respondent perceives and/or chooses to report.

The conclusions of this investigation involving the general population are limited to the norm group of the TSCS which was used to represent it. The data were gathered in relaxed, atypical school settings and could be distorted. They were collected at various meetings of central Iowa teachers and administrators from those in attendance. The demographic information collected on the data sheet is also limited by the memory of the respondents as no means were available to check the accuracy of any response.

### Discussion

A "high" self concept means a person has accepted himself and is therefore more capable of accepting others. He is generally more open-minded and less dependent upon events in his environment in the determination of his adequacy. A person who cannot deal with his own problems

cannot be expected to help others deal with theirs. People with low self concepts are often maladjusted and uncomfortable and are generally more easily persuaded and led. Neither a teacher, who daily must help children, nor an administrator who must daily help teachers, should function with this handicap.

It is comforting, as an educator and parent, to note that the teachers in this investigation do report higher self concepts than the general population and that the superintendents report even higher levels of self concept than did the teachers.

While the means of the respective groups are higher, an examination of the variance reveals that not all individual teachers and administrators are higher. Herein lies a fact of much importance. Individual teachers and administrators should receive the focus of attention for it is they that have the effect. Some teachers and administrators in this sample were very low in self concept.

Granted that this was not a random sample, nevertheless, a remarkable consistency must be noted in the findings. This consistency should be strong evidence for future studies of self concept and the professional educator. No doubt there is a great difference in the daily functioning of individuals reporting extreme opposites on the scale.

Research needs to be conducted to determine what the effects of teachers and administrators reporting different levels of self concept truly are. Do they handle students and other adults differently and if so how? Do some roles need different levels of self concept than others and if so what levels? What in our preservice and inservice training programs

affect the self concept and in what ways? Is the self concept changeable and stable?

These findings demonstrate that the self concept of these particular teachers and superintendents is high. Since as a group it is high, further consideration needs to now be given to the different levels within the group and to the individual effect on learning.

### Conclusions

The purpose of this investigation was simply to measure the self concept of various public school teacher and administrator groups and to make comparisons. The limitations of the study have been outlined and within the bounds of these limitations and on the basis of the findings of this investigation, the following conclusions were drawn:

(1) The teachers in this sample were higher in self concept, as measured by the TSCS, than the norm group of the TSCS. This was also true for most of the dimensions of self concept included on this instrument. They were also lower in reported variability.

(2) The administrators in this sample were higher in self concept, as measured by the TSCS, than the norm group of the TSCS. This was true also for most of the dimensions of self concept included on this instrument. They were also lower in reported variability.

(3) The superintendents in this sample were higher in self concept, as measured by the TSCS, than the teachers in this sample. This was true also for most of the dimensions of self concept included as part of the TSCS. They were also lower in reported variability and more definite in

their report.

(4) The superintendents in this sample were higher in self concept, as measured by the TSCS, than the administrators used in the sample. However, no other source of self concept variance was isolated for the total administrator sample.

#### Recommendations

(1) The results of this investigation should be verified. A broad population of adults should be selected and stratified by occupation and the sample drawn from the various strata. More reliance could be placed on such results and more contrasts of self concept as related to occupation could be made.

(2) More experiments in preservice and inservice education are recommended to determine the effect such programs might have on self concept. Such experimentation is needed for both teachers and administrators. The option to change one's personality should be open to teachers and administrators following degree or self improvement programs.

(3) Experiments designed to measure the effect that level of teacher self concept has on learning are also needed. Although some evidence is available, more is needed.

(4) An analysis of the TSCS item analysis found in Appendix B should provide clues for designing new categories such as social relationships. time spent with family, sleep habits, and type of hobbies. Further investigation of the relationship such topics have to self concept is recommended.

(5) The self concept level of administrators should be compared with their decision making patterns.

(6) Careful analysis of the TSCS item analysis, along with other possible statements could be the beginning of a special self concept measure specifically for school administrators. Such an instrument could be used for screening program candidates, to help design special individual training programs and to match individuals to jobs.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, Gordon W.  
1937 Personality: A psychological interpretation. H. Holt and Company, New York.
- American Psychological Association  
1966 Standards for educational and psychological tests and manuals. American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Anton, D. G.  
1968 A sociological study of the self concept and work role of the elementary school principal in selected first-class school districts in the State of Montana. Dissertation Abstracts 29: 1060A.
- Ashcraft, Carolyn and Fitts, W. H.  
1964 Self concept change in psychotherapy. Psychotherapy 1: 115-118.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development  
1969 Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective behavior. National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
- Bachman, Carl W., Secord, Paul F., and Peirce, Jerry R.  
1963 Resistance to change in the self concept as a function of consensus among significant others. Sociometry 26: 102-111.
- Beal, George M., Bohlen, Joe M., and Raudabaugh, J. Neil  
1962 Leadership and dynamic group action. Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa.
- Borg, Walter R.  
1963 Educational research: An introduction. David McKay Co. Inc., New York.
- Brooks, Robert Charles  
1968 Self concept changes as a function of participation in sensitivity training as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis. Library, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. (Microfilm order No. 68-17064. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)
- Brown, Frederick G.  
1970 Principles of educational and psychological testing. Dryden Press, Hinsdale, Illinois.



Brownfain, John J.

- 1965 Stability of the self concept as a dimension of personality. In Hamacheck, D., ed. The self in growth, teaching and learning: Selected readings. Pp. 269-286. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Buros, Oscar K.

- 1965 Mental measurements yearbook. 6th ed. Gryphon Press, Highland Park, New Jersey.

Campbell, Roald F.

- 1967 The changing role of the superintendent. Unpublished mimeographed paper presented at the University of Kansas. College of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Campbell, Roald F., Cunningham, Luvern L., and McPhee, Roderick F.

- 1965 The organization and control of American schools. C. E. Merrill Books, Columbus, Ohio.

Carlson, Richard O., Gallaher, Art, Jr., Miles, Matthew W., Pellegrin,

- 1965 Roland J. and Rogers, Everett M. Change processes in the public schools. The Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Eugene, Oregon.

Carlton, Lessie and Moore, Robert H.

- 1968 Reading, self-directive dramatization and self concept. C. E. Merrill Books, Columbus, Ohio.

Carson, J. O., Jr. and Schultz, Raymond E.

- 1964 A comparative analysis of the junior college dean's leadership behavior. Journal of Experimental Education 32, No. 4: 355-362.

Child, Irvin L.

- 1963 Problems of personality and some relations to anthropology and sociology. In Koch, S., ed. Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 5. Pp. 593-632. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York.

Combs, A. W.

- 1962 The self in chaos. Contemporary Psychology 7: 53-54.

Combs, A. W.

- 1965 The professional education of teachers: A perceptual view of teacher preparation. Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Massachusetts.

Combs, A. W., Soper, D. W., and Courson, C. C.

- 1963 The measurement of self concept and self report. Educational and Psychological Measurement 23: 493-500.

- Coopersmith, Stanley  
1967 The antecedents of self esteem. W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, California.
- Coopersmith, Stanley  
1969 Implications of studies on self-esteem for educational research and practice. ERIC ED 033742.
- Crites, J. O.  
1965 Test review: Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology 12: 330-331.
- Diggory, James C.  
1966 Self evaluation: Concepts and studies. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Dumas, Wayne  
1969 Factors associated with self concept change in student teachers. The Journal of Educational Research 62, No. 6: 275-278.
- Ebel, Robert L.  
1969 Encyclopedia of educational research. 4th ed. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Esser, Fred F.  
1969 An appraisal of the relationship of teacher self concept and their evaluation as administered by their principal. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis. Library, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska. (Microfilm order No. 69-22264. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)
- Fearning, J. L.  
1965 Some perceptions of executive professional leadership. ERIC ED 010 905.
- Ferreira, Joseph L.  
1970 The administrative internship and role change: a study of the relationship between interaction and attitude. Educational Administration Quarterly 6: 77-90.
- Fitts, William H.  
1965 Tennessee self concept scale manual. Counselor Recordings and Tests, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Fitts, William H.  
1966 The self concept and human behavior, Research Bulletin #1. Nashville Mental Health Center, Nashville, Tennessee.

- Fitts, William H. and Hamner, William T.  
 1969 The self concept and delinquency, Nashville Mental Health Center Monograph I. Nashville Mental Health Center, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Fitts, William H., Stewart, O. C., and Wagner, Merwyn  
 1969 Three studies of self concept change, Research Bulletin #6. Nashville Mental Health Center, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Fleming, E. E.  
 1967 Innovation related to the tenure, succession and orientation of the elementary principal. Dissertation Abstracts 28: 2024A.
- Ford, R. W.  
 1966 A relationship of psychological health of elementary school principals to the organizational climate of schools. Dissertation Abstracts 28: 900A.
- Freud, Sigmund  
 1935 A general introduction to psychoanalysis. Liveright Publishing Co., New York
- Gage, N. L.  
 1963 Paradigms for research in teaching. In Gage, N. L., ed. Handbook of research on teaching. Pp. 94-141. Rand McNally, Chicago, Illinois.
- Gage, N. L.  
 1965 Desirable behavior of teachers. Urban Education 1: 85-95.
- Gale, Raymond F.  
 1969 Developmental behavior: A humanistic approach. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Greenberg, G. U. and Frank, G. H.  
 1965 Response set in the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self Concept Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology 21: 287-288.
- Griffiths, Daniel E.  
 1959 Administrative theory. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.
- Gross, Neal C. and Herriott, Robert  
 1965 Staff leadership in public schools: A sociological inquiry. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Haas, Harold and Maehr, Martin  
 1965 Two experiments on the concept of self and the reaction of others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1: 100-105.

- Hamachek, Don E., ed.  
 1965 The self in growth, teaching and learning: Selected readings. Prentice Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Hamachek, Don E.  
 1966 Leadership styles, decision making, and the principal. National Elementary Principal 45: 26-31.
- Hamachek, Don E.  
 1969 Dynamics of the self. Wisconsin Journal of Education 101: 7-8.
- Hays, William  
 1963 Statistics. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Hemphill, John K., Griffiths, Daniel E. and Frederiksen, Norman  
 1962 Administrative performance and personality. Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York.
- Holsclaw, C. D.  
 1967 The relationship of selected factors to administrative effectiveness in the principalship. Dissertation Abstracts 28: 2027A.
- Hudson, Liam  
 1968 Frames of mind. Methuen and Co., London.
- James, William  
 1890 Principles of psychology. Henry Holt and Co., New York
- Johnson, Homer M., Carnie, George M. and Lawrence, Clifford J.  
 1967 Personality characteristics of school superintendents in relation to their willingness to accept innovation in education. ERIC ED 015 528.
- Jung, Carl G.  
 1966 Two essays on analytical psychology, collected works, Vol. 7. Bollington Foundation, New York.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L.  
 1966 The social psychology of organizations. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Kline, Charles E.  
 1966 Leader behavior, curricular implementation and curricular change. ERIC ED 027 596.
- Kluckhorn, C. and Murray, H. A.  
 1953 Personality formation: the determinants. In Kluckhorn, C. and Murray, H. A., eds. Personality in nature, society and culture. Pp. 53-70. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Knezevich, Steven J.

- 1962 Administration of public education. Harper and Brothers, New York.

LaBenne, Wallace and Greene, Bert I.

- 1969 Educational implications of self concept theory. Goodyear Publishing, Pacific Palisades, California.

Letner, Rodney Charles

- 1969 The effect of group counseling on the self concept as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis. Library, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana. (Microfilm order No. 69-19422. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

Lewin, Kurt

- 1936 Principles of topological psychology. McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., New York.

Ludwig, David and Maehr, Martin

- 1967 Changes in self concept and stated behavioral preferences. Child Development 38: 453-467.

Mabel, Sanford and Rosenfeld, H. M.

- 1966 Relationship of self concept to experience of imbalance in p-o-x situations. Human Relations 19, No. 4: 381-389.

Machinnon, Donald W.

- 1962 The nature and nature of creative talent. American Psychologist 17: 484-495.

Maslow, Abraham H.

- 1962 Some basic propositions of a growth and self-actualization society. In Combs, A. W., ed. Perceiving, behaving, becoming: A new focus on education. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.

McCallon, Earl L.

- 1966 Interpersonal perception characteristics of teachers. The Journal of Experimental Education 34, No. 3: 97-100.

McGrath, Joseph E. and Altman, Irwin

- 1966 Small group research - A synthesis and critique of the field. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Mead, George H.

- 1947 Language and the development of self. In Newcomb, Theodore M. and Hartley, Eugene, eds. Henry Holt and Company, New York.

Miles, Wilford Glenn, Jr.

- 1968 An investigation into the relationship between certain personality traits and management success. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Library, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas. (Microfilm order No. 68-15578. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

Miller, Daniel R.

- 1963 The study of social relationships: situation, identity and social interaction. In Koch, S., ed. Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 5. Pp. 639-726. McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., New York.

Miller, E. L.

- 1969 Correlations of risk-taking and selected socio-professional variables of public school superintendents. Dissertation Abstracts 29: 3807A.

Morse, Stanley

- 1967 Social comparison, self consistency and the presentation of self. ERIC ED 019 680.

Owens, Robert G.

- 1970 Organizational behavior in schools. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Peach, S. W.

- 1967 Relationship between certain factors in the role of the school principal and the adoption of innovative instructional practices. Dissertation Abstracts 29: 104A.

Peatman, John G.

- 1963 Introduction to applied statistics. Harper and Row, New York.

Perkins, Hugh V.

- 1958 Factors influencing change in children's self concepts. Child Development 29: 221-230.

Ramer, B.

- 1968 The relationship of belief systems and personal characteristics of chief school administrators and attitudes toward educational innovation. Dissertation Abstracts 29: 782A.

Rentz, R. Robert and White, Wm. F.

- 1967 Factors of self perception in the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Perceptual and Motor Skills 24: 118.

Rogers, Carl R.

- 1947 Some observations on the organization of personality. American Psychologist 2: 358-368.

Rosenberg, Morris

- 1965 Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Rosenthal, Robert

- 1964 Experiments outcome, orientation and the results of psychological experiment. Psychological Bulletin 61: 405-412.

Rosenthal, Robert and Jacobson, Lenore

- 1968 Teacher expectations for the disadvantaged. Scientific American 218, No. 4: 19-23.

Ross, Ronald D.

- 1965 An exploration of the self concept of selected superintendents in Nebraska. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis. Library, The University of Nebraska Teachers College, Lincoln, Nebraska. (Microfilm order No. 65-7252. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

Sanford, Nevitt

- 1963 Personality: its place in psychology. In Koch, S., ed. Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 5. Pp. 488-519. McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., New York.

Seidman, Sylvia K.

- 1969 The self concept of elementary school student-teachers and its relationship to classroom verbal interaction. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis. Library, New York University, New York. (Microfilm order No. 69-21222. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

Snygg, Donald and Combs, Arthur W.

- 1949 Individual behavior. Harper, New York.

Stock, Dorothy

- 1949 An investigation into the interrelations between the self concept and feelings directed toward other persons and groups. Journal of Consulting Psychology 13: 176-180.

Sullivan, Harry Stack

- 1953 The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. Norton, New York.

Symonds, Percival M.

- 1951 The ego and the self. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.

Taylor, Donald

- 1955 Changes in self concept without psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology 19, No. 3: 205-209.

Trowbridge, Norma

- 1970 The measurement. In Rowson, J., ed. IMPACT 70. Polk County Board of Education, Des Moines, Iowa.

Vacchiano, R. B. and Strauss, P. S.

- 1968 The construct validity of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.  
Journal of Clinical Psychology 24: 323-326.

Vincent, J.

- 1968 An exploratory factor analysis relating to the construct of  
self concept labels. Educational and Psychological Measurement  
28, No. 3: 915-921.

Walsh, Walter B.

- 1966 Validity of the self report. Dissertation Abstracts 26: 5884A.

Weiss, D. J.

- 1968 A study of the relationship of participation in decision making,  
selected personality variables and job satisfaction of the  
Education Research and Development Council elementary school  
principals. Dissertation Abstracts 29: 3404A.

White, Kinnard

- 1965 Personality characteristics of educational leaders: a compari-  
son of administrators and researchers. School Review 73: 292-  
300.

Williams, Robert L. and Cole, Spurgeon

- 1967 Self concept and school adjustment. Personnel and Guidance  
Journal 46: 478-481.

Witkin, H. A.

- 1962 Psychological differentiation: Studies of development.  
John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Wyllie, Ruth C.

- 1961 The self concept. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln,  
Nebraska.

Zimiles, Herbert, Biber, B., Rabinowitz, W. and Hay, L.

- 1964 Personality aspects of teaching: a predictive study. Genetic  
Psychology Monographs 69: 101-149.



- (6) Number of whole years' experience in your present position? \_\_\_\_\_
- (7) Number of whole years' experience in similar positions? \_\_\_\_\_
- (8) Total whole years' experience in education? \_\_\_\_\_

Position:

- (9) Present position: Teacher \_\_\_\_\_  
 Elementary Principal \_\_\_\_\_  
 Secondary Principal \_\_\_\_\_  
 Superintendent \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

(10) Number of students under your supervision? \_\_\_\_\_

(11) Is there a town of 5,000 people or over in  
 your district? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

(12) Give the title of the position(s) to which you  
 consider yourself responsible. \_\_\_\_\_  
 (e.g. school board, superintendent, assistant  
 superintendent, principal, assistant principal,  
 etc.)

## APPENDIX B

Item analysis of the TSCS for selected  
school superintendents

Percent completely false	1	Percent mostly true	4
Percent mostly false	2	Percent completely true	5
Percent partly false and partly true	3		

Item	1	2	3	4	5
I have a healthy body.	1.4	.0	2.9	32.3	63.2
I am an attractive person.	.0	2.9	23.5	58.8	13.2
I consider myself a sloppy person.	55.8	33.8	5.8	1.4	2.9
I am a decent sort of person.	1.4	.0	2.9	45.5	50.0
I am an honest person.	1.4	.0	1.4	33.8	63.2
I am a bad person.	73.5	20.5	4.4	1.4	.0
I am a cheerful person.	1.4	.0	16.1	54.4	27.9
I am a calm and easy going person.	1.4	11.7	23.5	42.6	20.5
I am a nobody.	76.4	17.6	4.4	1.4	.0
I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.	1.4	.0	5.8	19.1	72.0
I am a member of a happy family.	1.4	.0	2.9	33.8	60.2
My friends have no confidence in me.	57.3	36.7	1.4	2.9	1.4
I am a friendly person.	1.4	.0	14.7	44.1	38.2
I am popular with men.	4.4	.0	16.1	63.2	16.1
I am not interested in what other people do.	38.2	41.1	5.8	11.7	2.9
I do not always tell the truth.	32.3	50.0	10.2	5.8	1.4
I get angry sometimes.	1.4	7.3	7.3	35.2	48.5
I like to look nice and neat all the time.	.0	2.9	4.4	52.9	38.2
I am full of aches and pains.	64.7	30.8	4.4	.0	.0
I am a sick person.	88.2	8.8	.0	1.4	1.4
I am a religious person.	1.4	4.4	29.4	47.0	17.6
I am a moral failure.	73.5	20.5	1.4	2.9	1.4
I am a morally weak person.	61.7	29.4	1.4	7.3	.0
I have a lot of self-control.	.0	1.4	8.8	52.9	36.7
I am a hateful person.	67.6	20.5	7.3	1.4	2.9
I am losing my mind.	91.1	4.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
I am an important person to my friends and family.	1.4	.0	5.8	33.8	57.3
I am not loved by my family.	88.2	8.8	.0	1.4	1.4
I feel that my family doesn't trust me.	85.2	8.8	1.4	1.4	1.4
I am popular with women.	4.4	1.4	36.7	45.5	10.2

Item (continued)	1	2	3	4	5
I am mad at the whole world.	85.2	11.7	.0	1.4	1.4
I am hard to be friendly with.	39.7	29.4	23.5	5.8	1.4
Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.	17.6	36.7	29.4	11.7	4.4
Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.	5.8	16.1	32.3	33.8	11.7
I am neither too fat nor too thin.	1.4	25.0	11.7	36.7	22.0
I like my looks just the way they are.	1.4	16.1	23.5	44.1	13.2
I would like to change some parts of my body.	29.4	26.4	13.2	20.5	8.8
I am satisfied with my moral behavior.	2.9	.0	10.2	39.7	45.5
I am satisfied with my relationship with God.	.0	2.9	19.1	47.0	29.4
I ought to go to church more.	19.1	29.4	14.7	23.5	11.7
I am satisfied to be just what I am.	1.4	5.8	17.6	52.9	19.1
I am just as nice as I should be.	1.4	11.7	39.7	32.3	13.2
I despise myself.	70.5	14.7	7.3	1.4	4.4
I am satisfied with my family relationships.	4.4	2.9	7.3	38.2	45.5
I understand my family as well as I should.	1.4	2.9	27.9	48.5	17.6
I should trust my family more.	36.7	39.7	11.7	8.8	1.4
I am as sociable as I want to be.	4.4	5.8	16.1	51.4	20.5
I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.	.0	5.8	16.1	51.4	25.0
I am no good at all from a social standpoint.	60.2	33.8	2.9	1.4	.0
I do not like everyone I know.	4.4	19.1	13.2	19.1	42.6
Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.	.0	.0	8.8	27.9	61.7
I am neither too tall nor too short.	1.4	8.8	11.7	25.0	50.0
I don't feel as well as I should.	50.0	32.3	7.3	2.9	2.9
I should have more sex appeal.	26.4	35.2	20.5	13.2	2.9
I am as religious as I want to be.	1.4	11.7	25.0	35.2	25.0
I wish I could be more trustworthy.	55.8	35.2	2.9	2.9	1.4
I shouldn't tell so many lies.	67.6	22.0	7.3	.0	.0
I am as smart as I want to be.	19.1	26.4	22.0	23.5	5.8
I am not the person I would like to be.	41.1	35.2	13.2	5.8	2.9
I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.	42.6	32.3	13.2	5.8	4.4
I treat my parents as well as I should.	2.9	10.2	17.6	45.5	22.0
I am too sensitive to things my family say.	30.8	44.1	14.7	7.3	1.4
I should love my family more.	27.9	30.8	23.5	11.7	4.4
I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.	4.4	2.9	7.3	55.8	26.4
I should be more polite to others.	23.5	35.2	19.1	14.7	5.8

Item (continued)	1	2	3	4	5
I ought to get along better with other people.	22.0	50.0	13.2	10.2	2.9
I gossip a little at times.	8.8	17.6	30.8	30.8	8.8
At times I feel like swearing.	.0	4.4	13.2	27.9	52.9
I take good care of myself physically.	1.4	7.3	17.6	52.9	19.1
I try to be careful about my appearance.	.0	1.4	2.9	45.5	48.5
I often act like I am "all thumbs".	20.5	54.4	17.6	5.8	.0
I am true to my religion in my everyday life.	.0	5.8	25.0	50.0	16.1
I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.	1.4	1.4	4.4	55.8	35.2
I sometimes do very bad things.	32.3	35.2	13.2	10.2	5.8
I can always take care of myself in any situation.	.0	8.8	19.1	60.2	10.2
I take the blame for things without getting mad.	1.4	7.3	30.8	38.2	19.1
I do things without thinking about them first.	20.5	54.4	16.1	5.8	1.4
I try to play fair with my friends and family.	.0	1.4	1.4	30.8	64.7
I take a real interest in my family.	1.4	.0	2.9	27.9	66.1
I give in to my parents.	5.8	11.7	44.1	32.3	4.4
I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.	.0	.0	5.8	52.9	39.7
I get along well with other people.	.0	.0	4.4	57.3	35.2
I do not forgive others easily.	17.6	47.0	22.0	8.8	2.9
I would rather win than lose in a game.	.0	2.9	1.4	20.5	73.5
I feel good most of the time.	.0	1.4	2.9	29.4	64.7
I do poorly in sports and games.	25.0	47.0	19.1	4.4	1.4
I am a poor sleeper.	44.1	27.9	17.6	4.4	4.4
I do what is right most of the time.	.0	1.4	.0	44.1	50.0
I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead.	42.6	36.7	16.1	1.4	1.4
I have trouble doing the things that are right.	45.5	48.5	2.9	.0	.0
I solve my problems quite easily.	.0	4.4	17.6	58.8	17.6
I change my mind a lot.	20.5	54.4	20.5	1.4	1.4
I try to run away from my problems.	47.0	44.1	2.9	.0	4.4
I do my share of work at home.	.0	4.4	14.7	41.1	38.2
I quarrel with my family.	30.8	52.9	11.7	2.9	.0
I do not act like my family thinks I should.	38.2	48.5	4.4	4.4	2.9
I see good points in all the people I meet.	2.9	2.9	19.1	51.4	22.0
I do not feel at ease with other people.	29.4	44.1	13.2	7.3	2.9
I find it hard to talk with strangers.	29.4	45.5	14.7	5.8	2.9
Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.	2.9	20.5	33.8	17.6	23.5